NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCLXIV.

MARCH, 1887.

SOME INTERROGATION POINTS.

A NEW party is struggling for recognition—a party with leaders who are not politicians, with followers who are not seekers after place. Some of those who suffer and some of those who sympathize, have combined. Those who feel that they are oppressed are organized for the purpose of redressing their wrongs. The workers for wages, and the seekers for work have uttered a protest. This party is an instrumentality for the accomplishment of certain things that are very near and very dear to the hearts of many millions.

The object to be attained is a fairer division of profits between employers and employed. There is a feeling that in some way the workers should not want—that the industrious should not be the indigent. There is a hope that men and women and children are not forever to be the victims of ignorance and want—that the tenement house is not always to be the home of the poor, nor the gutter the nursery of their babes.

As yet, the methods for the accomplishment of these aims have not been agreed upon. Many theories have been advanced and none has been adopted. The question is so vast, so complex, touching human interests in so many ways, that no one has yet been great enough to furnish a solution, or, if any one has furnished a solution, no one else has been wise enough to understand it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The hope of the future is that this question will finally be understood. It must not be discussed in anger. If a broad and comprehensive view is to be taken, there is no place for hatred or for prejudice. Capital is not to blame. Labor is not to blame. Both have been caught in the net of circumstances. The rich are as generous as the poor would be if they should change places. Men acquire through the noblest and the tenderest instincts. They work and save not only for themselves, but for their wives and for their children. There is but little confidence in the charity of the world. The prudent man in his youth makes preparation for his age. The loving father, having struggled himself, hopes to save his children from drudgery and toil.

In every country there are classes—that is to say, the spirit of caste, and this spirit will exist until the world is truly civilized. Persons in most communities are judged not as individuals, but as members of a class. Nothing is more natural, and nothing more heartless. These lines that divide hearts on account of clothes or titles are growing more and more indistinct, and the philanthropists, the lovers of the human race, believe that the time is coming when they will be obliterated. We may do away with kings and peasants, and yet there may still be the rich and the poor, the intelligent and foolish, the beautiful and deformed, the industrious and idle, and it may be, the honest and vicious. These classifications are in the nature of things. They are produced for the most part by forces that are now beyond the control of man—but the old rule, that men are disreputable in the proportion that they are useful, will certainly be reversed. The idle lord was always held to be the superior of the industrious peasant, the devourer better than the producer, and the waster superior to the worker.

While in this country we have no titles of nobility, we have the rich and the poor—no princes, no peasants, but millionaires and mendicants. The individuals composing these classes are continually changing. The rich of to-day may be the poor of to-morrow, and the children of the poor may take their places. In this country the children of the poor are educated substantially in the same schools with those of the rich. All read the same papers, many of the same books, and all for many years hear the same questions discussed. They are continually being educated, not only at schools, but by the press, by political campaigns, by perpetual discussions on public questions, and the result is that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those who are rich in gold are often poor in thought, and many who have not whereon to lay their heads have within those heads a part of the intellectual wealth of the world.

Years ago the men of wealth were forced to contribute towards the education of the children of the poor. The support of schools by general taxation was defended on the ground that it was a means of providing for the public welfare, of perpetuating the institutions of a free country by making better men and women. This policy has been pursued until at last the school house is larger than the church, and the common people through education have become uncommon. They now know how little is really known by what are called the upper classes—how little after all is understood by kings, presidents, legislators, and men of culture. They are capable not only of understanding a few questions, but they have acquired the art of discussing those that no one understands. With the facility of politicians they can hide behind phrases, make barricades of statistics, and chevaux-de-frise of inferences and assertions. They understand the sophistries of those who have governed.

In some respects these common people are the superiors of the so-called aristocracy. While the educated have been turning their attention to the classics, to the dead languages, and the dead ideas and mistakes that they contain—while they have been giving their attention to ceramics, artistic decorations, and compulsory prayers, the common people have been compelled to learn the practical things—to become acquainted with facts—by doing the work of the world. The professor of a college is no longer a match for a master mechanic. The master mechanic not only understands principles, but their application. He knows things as they are. He has come in contact with the actual, with realities. He knows something of the adaptation of means to ends, and this is the highest and most valuable form of education. The men who make locomotives, who construct the vast engines that propel ships, necessarily know more than those who have spent their lives in conjugating Greek verbs, looking for Hebrew roots, and discussing the origin and destiny of the universe.

Intelligence increases wants. By education the necessities of the people become increased. The old wages will not supply the new wants. Man longs for a harmony between the thought within and the things without. When the soul lives in a palace

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the body is not satisfied with rags and patches. The glaring inequalities among men, the differences in condition, the suffering and the poverty, have appealed to the good and great of every age, and there has been in the brain of the philanthropist a dream—a hope, a prophesy, of a better day.

It was believed that tyranny was the foundation and cause of the differences between men—that the rich were all robbers and the poor all victims, and that if a society or government could be founded on equal rights and privileges, the inequalities would disappear, that all would have food and clothes and reasonable work and reasonable leisure, and that content would be found by every hearth.

There was a reliance on nature—an idea that men had interfered with the harmonious action of great principles which if left to themselves would work out universal well-being for the human race. Others imagined that the inequalities between men were necessary—that they were part of a divine plan, and that all would be adjusted in some other world—that the poor here would be the rich there, and the rich here might be in torture there. Heaven became the reward of the poor, of the slave, and hell their revenge.

When our Government was established it was declared that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which were life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It was then believed that if all men had an equal opportunity, if they were allowed to make and execute their own laws, to levy their own taxes, the frightful inequalities seen in the despotisms and monarchies of the old world would entirely disappear. This was the dream of 1776. The founders of the Government knew how kings, and princes, and dukes, and lords, and barons had lived upon the labor of the peasants. They knew the history of those ages of want and crime, of luxury and suffering. But in spite of our Declaration, in spite of our Constitution, in spite of universal suffrage, the inequalities still exist. We have the kings and princes, the lords and peasants, in fact, if not in name. Monopolists, corporations, capitalists, workers for wages, have taken their places, and we are forced to admit that even universal suffrage cannot clothe and feed the world.

For thousands of years men have been talking and writing about the great law of supply and demand—and insisting that in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some way this mysterious law has governed and will continue to govern the activities of the human race. It is admitted that this law is merciless—that when the demand fails the producer, the laborer must suffer, must perish—that the law feels neither pity nor malice—it simply acts, regardless of consequences. Under this law, capital will employ the cheapest. The single man can work for less than the married. Wife and children are luxuries not to be enjoyed under this law. The ignorant have fewer wants than the educated, and for this reason can afford to work for less. The great law will give employment to the single and to the ignorant in preference to the married and intelligent. The great law has nothing to do with food or clothes, with filth or crime. It cares nothing for homes, for penitentiaries, or asylums. It simply acts—and some men triumph, some succeed, some fail, and some perish.

Others insist that the curse of the world is monopoly. And yet, as long as some men are stronger than others, as long as some are more intelligent than others, they must be, to the extent of such advantage, monopolists. Every man of genius is a monopolist.

We are told that the great remedy against monopoly—that is to say, against extortion, is free and unrestricted competition. But after all, the history of this world shows that the brutalities of competition are equaled only by those of monopoly. The successful competitor becomes a monopolist, and if competitors fail to destroy each other, the instinct of self-preservation suggests a combination. In other words, competition is a struggle between two or more persons or corporations for the purpose of determining which shall have the uninterrupted privilege of extortion.

In this country the people have had the greatest reliance on competition. If a railway company charged too much a rival road was built. As a matter of fact, we are indebted for half the railroads of the United States to the extortion of the other half, and the same may truthfully be said of telegraph lines. As a rule, while the exactions of monopoly constructed new roads and new lines, competition has either destroyed the weaker, or produced the pool which is a means of keeping both monopolies alive, or of producing a new monopoly with greater needs, supplied by methods more heartless than the old. When a rival road is built the people support the rival because the fares and freights are some-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what less. Then the old and richer monopoly inaugurates war, and the people, glorying in the benefits of competition, are absurd enough to support the old. In a little while the new company, unable to maintain the contest, left by the people at the mercy of the stronger, goes to the wall, and the triumphant monopoly proceeds to make the intelligent people pay not only the old price, but enough in addition to make up for the expenses of the contest.

Is there any remedy for this? None, except with the people themselves. When the people become intelligent enough to support the rival at a reasonable price; when they know enough to allow both roads to live; when they are intelligent enough to recognize a friend and to stand by that friend as against a known enemy, this question will be at least on the edge of a solution.

So far as I know this course has never been pursued except in one instance, and that is in the present war between the Gould and Mackay cables. The Gould system had been charging from sixty to eighty cents a word, and the Mackay system charged forty. Then the old monopoly tried to induce the rival to put the prices back to sixty. The rival refused, and thereupon the Gould combination dropped to twelve and a half, for the purpose of destroying the rival. The Mackay cable fixed the tariff at twenty-five cents, saying to its customers, "You are intelligent enough to understand what this war means. If our cables are defeated, the Gould system will go back not only to the old price, but will add enough to reimburse itself for the cost of destroying us. If you really wish for competition, if you desire a reasonable service at a reasonable rate, you will support us." Fortunately an exceedingly intelligent class of people does business by the cables. They are merchants, bankers, and brokers, dealing with large amounts, with intricate, complicated, and international questions. Of necessity, they are used to thinking for themselves. They are not dazzled into blindness by the glare of the present. They see the future. They are not duped by the sunshine of a moment or the promise of an hour. They see beyond the horizon of a penny saved. These people had intelligence enough to say, "The rival who stands between us and extortion is our friend, and our friend shall not be allowed to die."

Does not this tend to show that people must depend upon themselves, and that some questions can be settled by the intelli-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gence of those who buy, of those who use, and that customers are not entirely helpless ?

Another thing should not be forgotten, and that is this : there is the same war between monopolies that there is between individuals, and the monopolies for many years have been trying to destroy each other. They have unconsciously been working for the extinction of monopolies. These monopolies differ as individuals do. You find among them the rich and the poor, the lucky and the unfortunate, millionaires and tramps. The great monopolies have been devouring the little ones.

Only a few years ago the railways in this country were controlled by local directors and local managers. The people along the lines were interested in the stock. As a consequence, whenever any legislation was threatened hostile to the interests of these railways, they had local friends who used their influence with legislators, governors, and juries. During this time they were protected, but when the hard times came many of these companies were unable to pay their interest. They suddenly became socialists. They cried out against their prosperous rivals. They felt like joining the Knights of Labor. They began to talk about rights and wrongs. But in spite of their cries, they have passed into the hands of the richer roads—they were seized by the great monopolies. Now the important railways are owned by persons living in large cities or in foreign countries. They have no local friends, and when the time comes, and it may come, for the general government to say how much these companies shall charge for passengers and freight, they will have no local friends. It may be that the great mass of the people will then be on the other side. So that after all the great corporations have been busy settling the question against themselves.

Possibly a majority of the American people believe to-day that in some way all these questions between capital and labor can be settled by constitutions, laws, and judicial decisions. Most people imagine that a statute is a sovereign specific for any evil. But while the theory has all been one way, the actual experience has been the other—just as the free-traders have all the arguments and the protectionists most of the facts.

The truth is, as Mr. Buckle says, that for five hundred years all real advance in legislation has been made by repealing laws. Of one thing we must be satisfied, and that is that real monopolies

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have never been controlled by law, but the fact that such monopolies exist, is a demonstration that the law has been controlled. In our country, legislators are for the most part controlled by those who, by their wealth and influence, elect them. The few in reality cast the votes of the many, and the few influence the ones voted for by the many. Special interests, being active, secure special legislation, and the object of special legislation is to create a kind of monopoly—that is to say, to get some advantage. Chiefs, barons, priests, and kings ruled, robbed, destroyed, and duped, and their places have been taken by corporations, monopolists, and politicians. The large fish still live on the little ones, and the fine theories have as yet failed to change the condition of mankind.

Law in this country is effective only when it is the recorded will of a majority. When the zealous few get control of the Legislature, and laws are passed to prevent Sabbath-breaking, or wine-drinking, they succeed only in putting their opinions and provincial prejudices in legal phrase. There was a time when men worked from fourteen to sixteen hours a day. These hours have not been lessened, they have not been shortened by law. The law has followed and recorded, but the law is not a leader and not a prophet. It appears to be impossible to fix wages—just as impossible as to fix the values of all manufactured things, including works of art. The field is too great, the problem too complicated, for the human mind to grasp.

To fix the value of labor is to fix all values—labor being the foundation of all values. The value of labor cannot be fixed unless we understand the relations that all things bear to each other and to man. If labor were a legal tender—if a judgment for so many dollars could be discharged by so many days of labor,—and the law was that twelve hours of work should be reckoned as one day, then the law could change the hours to ten or eight, and the judgments could be paid in the shortened days. But it is easy to see that in all contracts made after the passage of such a law, the difference in hours would be taken into consideration.

We must remember that law is not a creative force. It produces nothing. It raises neither corn nor wine. The legitimate object of law is to protect the weak, to prevent violence and fraud, and to enforce honest contracts, to the end that each person may be free to do as he desires, provided only that he does

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not interfere with the rights of others. Our fathers tried to make people religious by law. They failed. Thousands are now trying to make people temperate in the same manner. Such efforts always have been and probably always will be failures. People who believe that an infinite God gave to the Hebrews a perfect code of laws, must admit that even this code failed to civilize the inhabitants of Palestine.

It seems impossible to make people just, or charitable, or industrious, or agreeable, or successful, by law, any more than you can make them physically perfect or mentally sound. Of course we admit that good people intend to make good laws, and that good laws, faithfully and honestly executed, tend to the preservation of human rights and to the elevation of the race, but the enactment of a law not in accordance with a sentiment already existing in the minds and hearts of the people—the very people who are depended upon to enforce this law—is not a help, but a hindrance. A real law is but the expression in an authoritative and accurate form of the judgment and desire of the majority. As we become intelligent and kind, this intelligence and kindness find expression in law.

But how is it possible to fix the wages of every man? To fix wages is to fix prices, and a Government, to do this intelligently, would necessarily have to have the wisdom generally attributed to an infinite being. It would have to supervise and fix the conditions of every exchange of commodities and the value of every conceivable thing. Many things can be accomplished by law. Employers may be held responsible for injuries to the employed. The mines can be ventilated. Children can be rescued from the deformities of toil—burdens taken from the backs of wives and mothers—houses made wholesome, food healthful—that is to say, the weak can be protected from the strong, the honest from the vicious, honest contracts can be enforced, and many rights protected.

The men who have simply strength, muscle, endurance, compete not only with other men of strength, but with the inventions of genius. What would doctors say if physicians of iron could be invented with curious cogs and wheels, so that when a certain button was touched the proper prescription would be written? How would lawyers feel if a lawyer could be invented in such a way that questions of law, being put in a kind of hopper and a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crank being turned, decisions of the highest Court could be prophesied without failure? And how would the ministers feel if somebody should invent a clergyman of wood that would to all intents and purposes answer the purpose?

Invention has filled the world with the competitors not only of laborers, but of mechanics—mechanics of the highest skill. To-day the ordinary laborer is for the most part a cog in a wheel. He works with the tireless—he feeds the insatiable. When the monster stops the man is out of employment, out of bread. He has not saved anything. The machine that he fed was not feeding him, was not working for him—the invention was not for his benefit. The other day I heard a man say that it was almost impossible for thousands of good mechanics to get employment, and that in his judgment the Government ought to furnish work for the people. A few minutes after, I heard another say that he was selling a patent for cutting out clothes, that one of his machines could do the work of twenty tailors, and that only the week before he had sold two to a great house in New York, and that over forty cutters had been discharged.

On every side men are being discharged and machines are being invented to take their places. When the great factory shuts down, the workers who inhabited it and gave it life, as thoughts do the brain, go away and it stands there like an empty skull. A few workmen, by the force of habit, gather about the closed doors and broken windows and talk about distress, the price of food, and the coming winter. They are convinced that they have not had their share of what their labor created. They feel certain that the machines inside were not their friends. They look at the mansion of the employer and think of the places where they live. They have saved nothing—nothing but themselves. The employer seems to have enough. Even when employers fail, when they become bankrupt, they are far better off than the laborers ever were. Their worst is better than the toilers' best.

The capitalist comes forward with his specific. He tells the workingman that he must be economical—and yet, under the present system, economy would only lessen wages. Under the great law of supply and demand every saving, frugal, self-denying workingman is unconsciously doing what little he can to reduce the compensation of himself and his fellows. The slaves who did not wish to run away helped fasten chains on those who did.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So the saving mechanic is a certificate that wages are high enough. Does the great law demand that every worker live on the least possible amount of bread? Is it his fate to work one day, that he may get enough food to be able to work another? Is that to be his only hope—that and death?

Capital has always claimed and still claims the right to combine. Manufacturers meet and determine upon prices, even in spite of the great law of supply and demand. Have the laborers the same right to consult and combine? The rich meet in the bank, the club-house, or parlor. Workingmen, when they combine, gather in the street. All the organized forces of society are against them. Capital has the army and the navy, the legislative, the judicial, and the executive departments. When the rich combine, it is for the purpose of "exchanging ideas." When the poor combine, it is a "conspiracy." If they act in concert, if they really do something, it is a "mob." If they defend themselves, it is "treason." How is it that the rich control the departments of Government? In this country the political power is equally divided among the men. There are certainly more poor than there are rich. Why should the rich control? Why should not the laborers combine for the purpose of controlling the executive, legislative, and judicial departments? Will they ever find how powerful they are?

In every country there is a satisfied class—too satisfied to care. They are like the angels in Heaven, who are never disturbed by the miseries of earth. They are too happy to be generous. This satisfied class asks no questions and answers none. They believe the world is as it should be. All reformers are simply disturbers of the peace. When they talk low, they should not be listened to; when they talk loud, they should be suppressed.

The truth is to-day what it always has been—what it always will be—those who feel are the only ones who think. A cry comes from the oppressed, from the hungry, from the down-trodden, from the unfortunate, from men who despair and from women who weep. There are times when mendicants become revolutionists—when a rag becomes a banner, under which the noblest and bravest battle for the right.

How are we to settle the unequal contest between men and machines? Will the machine finally go into partnership with the laborer? Can these forces of nature be controlled for the benefit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of her suffering children? Will extravagance keep pace with ingenuity? Will the workers become intelligent enough and strong enough to be the owners of the machines? Will these giants, these Titans, shorten or lengthen the hours of labor? Will they give leisure to the industrious, or will they make the rich richer, and the poor poorer?

Is man involved in the "general scheme of things?" Is there no pity, no mercy? Can man become intelligent enough to be generous, to be just; or does the same law or fact control him that controls the animal and vegetable world? The great oak steals the sunlight from the smaller trees. The strong animals devour the weak—everything eating something else—everything at the mercy of beak, and claw, and hoof, and tooth—of hand and club, of brain and greed—inequality, injustice everywhere.

The poor horse standing in the street with his dray overworked, over-whipped, and under-fed, when he sees other horses groomed to mirrors, glittering with gold and silver, scorning with proud feet the very earth, probably indulges in the usual socialistic reflections, and this same horse, worn out and old, deserted by his master, turned into the dusty road, leans his head on the topmost rail, looks at donkeys in a field of clover, and feels like a Nihilist.

In the days of savagery the strong devoured the weak—actually ate their flesh. In spite of all the laws that man has made, in spite of all advance in science, literature and art, the strong, the cunning, the heartless still live on the weak, the unfortunate, and foolish. True, they do not eat their flesh, they do not drink their blood, but they live on their labor, on their self-denial, their weariness and want. The poor man who deforms himself by toil, who labors for wife and child through all his anxious, barren, wasted life—who goes to the grave without ever having had one luxury—has been the food of others. He has been devoured by his fellow-men. The poor woman living in the bare and lonely room, cheerless and fireless, sewing night and day to keep starvation from a child, is slowly being eaten by her fellow-men. When I take into consideration the agony of civilized life—the number of failures, the poverty, the anxiety, the tears, the withered hopes, the bitter realities, the hunger, the crime, the humiliation, the shame—I am almost forced to say that cannibalism, after all, is the most merciful form in which man has ever lived upon his fellow-man.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some of the best and purest of our race have advocated what is known as Socialism. They have not only taught, but, what is much more to the purpose, have believed that a nation should be a family; that the government should take care of all its children; that it should provide work, and food, and clothes, and education for all, and that it should divide the results of all labor equitably with all.

Seeing the inequalities among men, knowing of the destitution and crime, these men were willing to sacrifice, not only their own liberties, but the liberties of all.

Socialism seems to be one of the worst possible forms of slavery. Nothing in my judgment would so utterly paralyze all the forces, all the splendid ambitions and aspirations that now tend to the civilization of man. In ordinary systems of slavery there are some masters, a few are supposed to be free; but in a socialistic state all would be slaves.

If the government is to provide work it must decide for the worker what he must do. It must say who shall chisel statues, who shall paint pictures, who shall compose music, and who shall practice the professions. Is any government, or can any government, be capable of intelligently performing these countless duties? It must not only control work, it must not only decide what each shall do, but it must control expenses, because expenses bear a direct relation to products. Therefore the government must decide what the worker shall eat and wherewithal he shall be clothed; the kind of house in which he shall live; the manner in which it shall be furnished, and, if this government furnishes the work, it must decide on the days or the hours of leisure. More than this, it must fix values; it must decide not only who shall sell, but who shall buy, and the price that must be paid—and it must fix this value not simply upon the labor, but on everything that can be produced, that can be exchanged or sold.

Is it possible to conceive of a despotism beyond this? The present condition of the world is bad enough, with its poverty and ignorance, but it is far better than it could by any possibility be under any government like the one described. There would be less hunger of the body, but not of the mind. Each man would simply be a citizen of a large penitentiary, and, as in every well regulated prison, somebody would decide what each should do. The inmates of a prison retire early; they rise with the sun;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they have something to eat; they are not dissipated; they have clothes; they attend divine service; they have but little to say about their neighbors; they do not suffer from cold; their habits are excellent, and yet, no one envies their condition. Socialism destroys the family. The children belong to the State. Certain officers take the places of parents. Individuality is lost.

The human race cannot afford to exchange its liberty for any possible comfort. You remember the old fable of the fat dog that met the lean wolf in the forest. The wolf, astonished to see so prosperous an animal, inquired of the dog where he got his food, and the dog told him that there was a man who took care of him, gave him his breakfast, his dinner, and his supper with the utmost regularity, and that he had all that he could eat and very little to do. The wolf said, "Do you think this man would treat me as he does you?" The dog replied, "Yes, come along with me." So they jogged on together toward the dog's home. On the way the wolf happened to notice that some hair was worn off the dog's neck, and he said, "How did the hair become worn?" "That is," said the dog, "the mark of the collar—my master ties me at night." "Oh," said the wolf, "Are you chained? Are you deprived of your liberty? I believe I will go back. I prefer hunger."

It is impossible for any man with a good heart to be satisfied with this world as it now is. No one can truly enjoy even what he earns—what he knows to be his own—knowing that millions of his fellow-men are in misery and want. When we think of the famished we feel that it is almost heartless to eat. To meet the ragged and shivering makes one almost ashamed to be well dressed and warm—one feels as though his heart was as cold as their bodies.

In a world filled with millions and millions of acres of land waiting to be tilled, where one man can raise the food for hundreds, millions are on the edge of famine. Who can comprehend the stupidity at the bottom of this truth?

Is there to be no change? Are "the law of supply and demand," invention and science, monopoly and competition, capital and legislation always to be the enemies of those who toil?

Will the workers always be ignorant enough and stupid enough to give their earnings for the useless? Will they support millions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of soldiers to kill the sons of other workingmen? Will they always build temples for ghosts and phantoms, and live in huts and dens themselves? Will they forever allow parasites with crowns, and vampires with mitres, to live upon their blood? Will they remain the slaves of the beggars they support? How long will they be controlled by friends who seek favors, and by reformers who want office? Will they always prefer famine in the city to a feast in the fields? Will they ever feel and know that they have no right to bring children into this world that they cannot support? Will they use their intelligence for themselves, or for others? Will they become wise enough to know that they cannot obtain their own liberty by destroying that of others? Will they finally see that every man has a right to choose his trade, his profession, his employment, and has the right to work when, and for whom, and for what he will? Will they finally say that the man who has had equal privileges with all others has no right to complain, or will they follow the example that has been set by their oppressors? Will they learn that force, to succeed, must have a thought behind it, and that anything done, in order that it may endure, must rest upon the corner-stone of justice?

Will they, at the command of priests, forever extinguish the spark that sheds a little light in every brain? Will they ever recognize the fact that labor, above all things, is honorable—that it is the foundation of virtue? Will they understand that beggars cannot be generous, and that every healthy man must earn the right to live? Will honest men stop taking off their hats to successful fraud? Will industry, in the presence of crowned idleness, forever fall upon its knees, and will the lips unstained by lies forever kiss the robed impostor's hand?

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY AM I A BAPTIST?

THE primary ideal of Baptists is not to build up an ecclesiastical system, but to create high and manly Christian character. In other words, it is to create in each individual soul and life a legitimate independency of all men, in matters of faith and practice Godward. The more Christlike each man becomes in his estimates and standards of character, the more he will prize his individual rights as one of Christ's freemen, and the more sacredly he will guard the rights of others. As Baptists have no formulated and authoritative creeds or decretals to which all their members must subscribe, few outside of their own ranks have made their tenets and practices a special study, or are capable of giving such an account of these as their churches would pronounce either fair or correct. Possibly none of the other large Christian bodies commonly known as "Evangelical" suffer so much from misconception and misrepresentation; hence, a candid reader will be grateful for an honest answer to the question: "Why am I a Baptist?"

The Baptist Year Book for 1886 reports 28,953 Baptist churches in the United States, with 2,572,238 communicants. These do not form one united church under an enforced standard of doctrine and a prescribed order of government, from which no congregation may vary. The aggregated sect is denominated by itself as the "Baptist Denomination," and not the Baptist Church, because each separate congregation is held to be a complete New Testament church in itself. These thousands of churches, therefore, are entirely distinct from each other, and are independent in the management of their several internal affairs, much after the pattern of private families in social life. Their only visible element of unity is the Bible and the common faith and practice which they severally gather from its teachings. In the United States there are 1,305 Baptist associations, but these organizations hold no analogy to the synods, presbyteries, conferences, or convocations of other Christian bodies. Voluntary associations are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formed by the churches of any given vicinity simply for fraternal purposes. In these they confer with each other about the scriptural application of their common principles, the subject of missions, the best methods of church work, the establishment and support of educational interests, and, if any church seeks advice in the management of its own affairs, the association will give it counsel. Its suggestions, however, in all cases, are merely advisory, and can in no wise bind the church which seeks its advice. All the churches hold that Christ has reserved to Himself, as the Head of the churches, the absolute right of legislation for their government, and that He has laid down His changeless statutes in the sacred Scriptures; consequently no Baptist body claims legislative prerogatives. Then all executive and judicial rights are lodged by Him in the churches themselves. From the decisions of the individual church, in all that concerns its own affairs, there can be no appeal, so that within its own jurisdiction its application of New Testament laws is final. It pretends to no infallibility in its interpretation of those laws, and hence it may seek the counsel of other churches in difficult cases, but it reserves final action to itself, because it is quite as infallible as those sister churches, who necessarily know less of its affairs, after the fullest explanation, than it knows itself. They can neither instruct it nor hold it under any authority whatever when it declines to follow their advice, and so each church is as absolute a spiritual democracy for all the purposes of self government as if it were the only church organization on earth.

In the exercise of these democratic rights, it forms itself into a church in the first place, without the assistance of any outside body. Its only officers are a pastor and deacons; it directs in the administration of the ordinances which Christ has appointed; it receives its own members generally by a majority vote given in its business meetings; it enforces its own discipline by the exercise of its popular suffrage, and is self-governing in all respects. Each member stands on an exact equality in all that relates to the exercise of his voice and vote in the management of its affairs, from the pastor down to its obscurest member, and everything necessary to its well-being is done in open assembly, much after the form of the primary town-meeting in the body politic. The pastor is a member of the body which he serves, and not of a separate clerical order outside of the church. He is responsible

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only to his own church, being answerable to it for all his conduct, private and official. His settlement, dismission, or punishment for wrong-doing are entirely in the hands of his own congregation. Necessarily, his moral influence is larger than that of other members of his flock, provided that he maintains a high grade of pastoral consistency and Christ-like character; but his office invests him with no ecclesiastical authority above that of any other member. This democratic parity is maintained on our Lord's decision: "All ye are brethren." His pastoral duty consists in feeding and tending the flock of Christ, under the direction of the Great Shepherd, so that he is the servant of the church for Christ's sake, while Christ is his only Master and theirs. Thus, the organic character of a Baptist church brings every member thereof back to his individual responsibility, on the broad basis of liberty and equality, removing membership therein as far as possible from all savor of officialism. The natural tendency of this liberal system is the cultivation of a proper respect for his own enlarged manhood. Of course, a self-willed man, or a supine and ignorant man, who has little regard for his better nature, will act unworthily of this highly honorable order of church life and of the sacred trusts which it imposes, just as the same class of men disgrace their own citizenship in the State. But as free citizenship is adapted to lift the freeman above mere residence in the State, so in this case, freedom from every yoke which would bind a Baptist to the unquestioning obedience of church superiors lifts him far above the membership of a mere conventionalism in the church of Christ. Such religious democracy cannot be true to itself, unless it conserves the rights of others, on principle. But where this is guarded, the personal Christian must love Christ more than ecclesiasticism, must be a better disciple of Christ than a churchman, and must give freer scope to his individual thought and action than he can command where his voice in church management is denied. He is bone of the bone which frames the church of his choice, and, being free from all outside domination, he stands as the peer of his brethren in the discharge of equal duties and the exercise of equal rights. Such a democracy is educative and every way calculated to make an entire brotherhood relatively strong in Christian manliness, robust in a self-reliance which these stout principles must inspire when they are held and used intelligently.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Manly characteristics are fostered and developed in Baptist churches by their radical requirements concerning the material of which they are composed. Many foolishly suppose that the chief difference between them and other churches is found in the questions growing out of baptism. A greater caricature could scarcely be drawn than that which is couched in this mistake. Possibly, it grows in part out of the name "Baptists," for, unhappily, the names of Christian denominations generally are sad misnomers in this age. Judging from these alone, it is natural to suppose that baptism draws the line of demarkation between Baptists and others; but for the same reason it might be supposed that the only difference between Presbyterians and others is found in that they have a Presbytery; or in the case of Methodists, that they follow the lines of method; or in that of Episcopalians, that they hold to an Episcopacy in government. Yet, none of these regard their name as characterizing their chief differences with their brethren. All of them, under their several definitions, claim to have a valid baptism, an efficient Presbytery, an order of bishops, and a methodical rule of life. Wherever these honorable bodies may locate their distinguishing differences, the Baptists place theirs in the demand for a positive moral change wrought in the soul of the convert, by the direct agency of the Holy Spirit, as an indispensable qualification for membership in their churches. The New Testament, in describing this change, uses the several phrases, "born from above," "born of God," "born again;" a state commonly known in Evangelical parlance, as regeneration by the Holy Spirit. This condition peremptorily forbids all membership in the churches secured by civil law, as in State Churches; all birthright membership secured by infant baptism; and all place in the churches secured by a merely intellectual subscription to a set of tenets or to an ecclesiastical creed. The very essence of the Baptist position is found in the fact that an intelligent personal trust in Christ for salvation forms the basis of Gospel church life. The rejection of infant baptism and submission to immersion according to the New Testament are pure corollaries of this vital requirement. Neither the rejection of infant baptism nor submission to immersion, nor both together, make a Baptist. The first qualification is found in thorough soul regeneration, and these considerations touching baptism are purely secondary thereto. Neither can baptism be put in the place of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regeneration, nor be so associated with the new birth that the one does not exist without the other. Baptists never administer baptism to the firmest believer until he has satisfied the church that he is regenerate already; then, because he is regenerate, his regeneration entitles him to baptism. Having satisfied the church that a divine work has been wrought on his moral nature, this is attested by his "burial with Christ in baptism." Christ has nowhere empowered his church to violate the free choice of any human being, by forcing baptism upon him without his personal knowledge of Christ as his Saviour; and when he has voluntarily taken upon him the service of Christ, the church has no right to deny him this privilege of discipleship; hence, he is baptized, not to regenerate him, but because he is entitled to baptism as one who is already regenerated by the Holy Spirit.

In keeping with this view, Baptists hold that no church has the right to add to its membership those for whom Christ did not appoint specific terms of membership. He bestowed on every man the absolute right to examine and embrace Christianity for himself, and by the end of the first century, every precept and practice which he enjoined were embodied in the New Testament. That book, therefore, informs every person what order of obedience the Christian Scriptures require at his hands, and of what material the Apostolic Churches were composed, so that under these circumstances, no church of after times has the right to tamper with, much less to alter or deviate from, the Apostolic model. For this and other reasons, the Baptists protest against making any tradition, patristic or catholic, any creed, canon, law, or decree, no matter how old it may be or by whom constructed, the fountain of doctrines, ordinances, or government. They appeal to the Scriptures alone, and will stand or fall on their teachings. Herbert Spencer in his "Data of Ethics" (p. 257), expresses the hope that the ethical principles laid down by Christ will eventually be acted upon in the practice of the world. But Baptists insist that for all religious purposes the New Testament shall be appealed to now, as well as for all moral ends, and that in such an appeal duty to himself links every man to the divine right of interpreting for himself what those Scriptures teach. He is bound by every consideration which is worthy of his nature to shake off all false deference for other authority, to use all the powers of his mind in an independent investigation of the New Testament, with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pure-hearted purpose to be governed by its facts and truths. But in consideration that he is not infallible, he must divest himself of all conceit, and come to the investigation as an honest and reverential seeker of the truth, for the truth's sake. The right of privately interpreting the Scriptures, as the gift of God to every man, does not carry with it the right of any man to follow his own fancies, predilections or whims in choosing what he will obey and what he will throw aside, nor does it allow him to diverge from or add to its teachings, as his convenience may dictate. This, at the best, would be mere trifling with the truth, which must finally convert the doctrine of liberty into rebellion against its Author. No church can step in between the Scriptures and the personal convictions of the man who searches the Scriptures for the purpose of honestly obeying them, nor can it enforce any teaching upon him by sheer authority, though that teaching itself be purely Scriptural. Church authority is nothing here against personal conviction, nor has the civil magistrate the power to prescribe a religion for his fellow-man, neither has he the right to punish them for rejecting the religion which the State prescribes.

This broad doctrine of soul-liberty the Baptists have maintained for century after century, against the rack, the dungeon and the stake in Europe; and against fine, imprisonment, scourging, and banishment in America during its early history. This is abundantly clear from the writings of Locke, Milton, Roger Williams, Jeremy Taylor, Motley and Bancroft. In regard to their sufferings in this country, a most frank and reliable account of their struggles for religious liberty has just been given by Brooks Adams, son of the late Charles Francis Adams (Chap. IV.), in his "Emancipation of Massachusetts." Baptists sincerely regret that all men are not Christians, and would rejoice if all Christians held their principles; but they resist the assumed right of all churches to connect themselves with the State, and they resist all governments which arrogate to themselves the prerogative to establish a church, or even to maintain religion itself by law,—to support the conformists to any church, to punish the nonconformists,—or to interfere in any way with the free exercise of any man's religion. They would not submit to have their own doctrines or practices enforced either upon themselves or others by any human government or statute. The laws of Massachusetts

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

banished them for about half a century; as early as 1656 the laws of New Netherland fined, imprisoned, and banished them; and in Virginia they were hounded by the same cruelties till after the Revolutionary war. Virginia law proscribed them until their right to worship God "according to the dictates of conscience" was secured to them by the 20th section of its "Bill of Rights." Even the Constitution of the United States did not fully protect them at first, as its VI. Article left Congress at liberty to impose religious tests in other cases than those of "office or public trust under the United States." The entire Baptist body, without a known exception, supported the Revolution, and, as free Americans, they demanded a guarantee of religious liberty ingrafted into the organic law of the land. Jefferson, Madison, Patrick Henry, and others, stood by them, and on the 8th of August, 1789, they laid their claim to full religious liberty before Gen. Washington, then President of the Union. He also espoused their cause, recommended to Congress, and on September 23d, 1789, by his influence, caused the amendment found in the I. Article to be passed, which says that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Baptists reject the doctrine of toleration in religion, and demand absolute religious freedom as the inalienable right of all men, because, by implication, the power which claims the right to tolerate others also claims the right to crush them when it chooses to tolerate them no longer. They maintain that so far as the civil law is concerned, a man may be a Jew, a Mohammedan, a Christian of any sect, a Pagan, or an infidel, with impunity.

As far back as 1527, the Swiss Baptists, in their confession of Schleitheim, drew the distinction between the right of the civil power to enforce civil law and order, and its power to punish for religion. In 1614, Leonard Buscher, a Baptist of London, wrote to King James, in his Plea for Liberty of Conscience: "May it please your majesty and Parliament to understand that, by fire and sword, to constrain princes and peoples to receive that one religion of the Gospel, is wholly against the mind and merciful law of Christ, dangerous both to king and state." Roger Williams, the founder of Rhode Island, said, in 1644, that "it was the will and command of God that permission of the most Paganish, Jewish, Turkish, or anti-Christian consciences and worships be granted to all men in all nations and counties. That

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

civil states with their officers of justice are not governors or defenders of the spiritual and Christian state and worship." All Baptists agree with these, their great ancestors, that every form of disability or persecution for religion is radically wrong, and should a Baptist rob any man of his religious liberty by statute, penalty, or sword, in that act and for that reason he would cease to be a Baptist. Everywhere they have been put to death for this doctrine of religious freedom. On the plains of the Netherlands and in higher Germany, in the Alpine valleys and crags of Switzerland, and in the cities of England, the ashes of their martyrs have been the sport of fitful winds and brutal men, for their fidelity to this principle. Indeed, the true history of the Dutch, German, and Swiss States, of Great Britain and the United States of America, cannot be written apart from the philosophical positions of this peculiar and ancient Republic of churches on the subject of civil and religious liberty. According to Bancroft, the most pronounced and best defined rights of man, which fifty millions of American freeman boast to-day, find historic recognition in the chronicles of their struggles and progress. The germinal idea of all Baptist life is, and ever has been, that the eternal law of God lays the axe at the root of all class, condition, or caste in religious life, and that the religion of Christ is an elevating democracy for every soul of man.

Again, Baptists utterly reject the effete system of sacramentarianism, as unworthy of human belief and contradictory of Christ's efficacious mediation. Neither baptism nor the Lord's Supper were ordained by Him for the purposes of human salvation. The ample and even infinite provisions which He made to that end are found in the sacrifice of Himself and the work of the Comforter. Therefore, Baptists insist that His ordinances shall be left in the places which He gave to them, and shall not be made to usurp His saving office and honor. His body was buried first in the waves of the Jordan, then in the tomb of Joseph, and baptism preaches like burial with Him. The religious use of all the waters on the globe has never removed one stain of sin from man's conscience or heart, neither can bread and wine, taken at the supper, impart the grace of God or prove its existence in the soul of the communicant. The only design of the supper is to "proclaim His death till He come." So far from exerting a saving influence, in part or whole, upon the souls of those who receive

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these ordinances, He enjoined them simply as acts of personal obedience to Himself. They are monuments of the great work which He wrought for us, but neither of them can be moral renovators of the soul. Baptists believe that there is no more dangerous heresy than that which invests baptism with any moral power or magical energy in purifying the heart, or that which makes it in any sense the channel through which the saving grace of God is conveyed to man. They also hold that it is quite as dangerous a heresy to make the supper a test of Christian fellowship, a proof of Christian character, or a visible bond of Christian love. From Judas Iscariot down, thousands have sat with Christ's disciples at one common table, who were entirely destitute of Christian character, affection, or fellowship. The act of partaking at the same supper table, neither Christianizes those who gather there nor un-Christianizes those who do not. The New Testament is a stranger to all such arrogant ecclesiastical assumptions. Christians celebrate two symbolical acts in observing the ordinances, nothing more, for Christ Himself is their Saviour, not his ordinances. His mediation saves men, not their baptism; and their souls feed, not on the loaf of the supper, but on Him, the True Bread from heaven. The Apostle James finds the true test of Christian love, fellowship, and character, in feeding and clothing a destitute brother. The Apostle Paul finds it in distributing to the necessities of the saints, in their bearing each others' burdens, in forbearing with each other and forgiving each other, and in doing good of every sort to those who are of the household of faith. The Apostle John lodges it in a willingness to lay down their lives for each other, if need be. Yet the Master of all these Apostles puts it on a higher plane than any of them, when he locates true love in the golden rule: "Whatsoever ye will that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." This test is worth something, because it costs something, having cost him his own life. That sacramentarian standard which tests and proves Christian love and character by the act of eating bread together and drinking of the same cup, is of too cheap an order to meet the requirements of Christ and His Apostles. Strangers who never met before, who have never passed a word or exchanged a kind act with each other, are ever and anon receiving a morsel of bread and taking a sip of wine in common at the Supper, but what special love do they show to each other in that act more than they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had previously shown before such a meeting? When the divine tests of love established by the New Testament are pushed aside, and one Christian comes to measure his love to another by a circumstantial act in which any hypocrite or profane person may share, if he pleases to do so, it is time to ask the question: "Whether or not ecclesiasticism is erecting its own standard or Christ's?"

For reasons equally cogent and scriptural Baptists reject that sacramentarian doctrine commonly known as infant baptism. No well defined ground has yet been taken in justification of this practice but that chosen by Augustine and adopted by the Roman Catholic communion, namely, that if an infant dies unchristened it is excluded from Heaven. This position is consistent with itself, because it holds that baptism is regeneration *de facto*, and as the babe is defiled by original sin, that, therefore, baptism secures its salvation. Those who christen children outside of the Catholic fold have never yet been able to define what practical moral relation the christened babe holds either to God or man, the church on earth or the church in Heaven, which he did not hold before his christening. Some of the Protestant state churches of Europe give this verbal definition, and all of them give it in substance, namely, that baptism makes him "A child of God, a member of Christ, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." Thus the nominal membership of these churches is made up of those who are christened according to the law of the land, and its inhabitants are brought into the state church without their knowledge or consent. Other churches than those which are established by law, both in Europe and in America, are strangely perplexed as to the relation which a christened infant sustains to their church organizations. They hold that before his baptism the unconscious babe is as much regenerated as after. They further hold that, before his christening, he is not a member of their churches, and yet, that, after his baptism, he is not so united with the church as to discharge the proper duties which devolve upon the recognized members of that body. He is not expected to meet its responsibilities, to contribute to its support, to attend its worship, to honor its brotherhood, to share its privileges, not even in receiving the Lord's Supper, nor to answer to its watchful discipline for his bad conduct. Then, if his infant brother or sister dies unchristened, these churches understand the Gospel

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

too well, and love it too much, to suppose for a moment that the gate of Heaven is shut in his face for that reason,—a conclusion which all who are Christ-like in Heaven and earth must approve.

From the teachings of the New Testament, Baptists are compelled to believe that the helpless infant who is taken from the bosom of his parents on earth, whether those parents be Christians or heathen, Jews or Mohammedans, religionists of any sort or infidels, is, by virtue of our Lord's mediation, eternally sheltered and beatified in the bosom of the Lamb of God in Heaven. Further, Baptists are deterred from the christening of their infant offspring by that God-fearing, parental love which will not pervert a Gospel ordinance by submitting a babe thereto, and so leave him in a nondescript relation which he is a stranger to in the Gospel. In their apprehension of a pure New Testament church, to christen him would leave him stamped neither with the distinctive mark of the regenerate nor of the unregenerate. To christen him, would assume that he is not exactly fit for heaven if he should die unbaptized, nor entirely fit for full fellowship in the church on earth if he lives and is baptized. For this and many other reasons, Baptists say with Lange, of Jena, who is far enough from being of their communion : "Would the Protestant Church fulfill and attain to its final destiny, the baptism of infants must of necessity be abolished." As it has already been said, the primary thought with Baptists is to make men stalwart Christians, who know what they believe, and why they hold their faith. They make baptism so subordinate in the Christian system, that instead of enforcing it as a fundamental act in the religious life of a human being, they do reverence to that new immortal life by first teaching it the knowledge of sin, the need of a Saviour, and the precious act of loving Him. As they attribute no merit nor virtue to baptism, they first consecrate him to Christ as a being endowed with reason and responsibility. They dedicate him to God in the holiness of parental prayer, watchful love, and holy training ; then, as soon as he is able to discern the Lord's death, they labor to win him to Christ's cross that he may take Christ's yoke upon himself by personal choice. No amount of ecclesiastical blame, misrepresentation, or even contempt, can make a Baptist of brain and manly honesty see the consistency of baptizing his infant when out of the church, and then leaving him there until by his personal conversion he is allowed to come in, because that con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

version has made him fit for the church both below and above. Nor can he as a parent, responsible to God, impose upon his child the injurious notion, that because he has been christened as a babe, he has somehow entered into covenant with God, to which covenant he was not himself a party. This would delude the child with the notion that he is not to be saved precisely as unchristened children are. If his baptism did not engraft him into Christ and His church, it will greatly perplex him to know what it meant; and if it did so engraft him, he must conclude that some moral relation exists between Christ and himself which unbaptized children do not sustain; and hence, that he needs no such spiritual regeneration as they need. Baptists cannot put their children under the deleterious spell of such a contradiction and superstition. They must be led to Christ first, to be saved by actual trust in His redeeming merits without the use of baptism, and then they must be baptized in obedience to His command, because they love Him and voluntarily obey Him. These are some of the reasons, and but some, "Why I am a Baptist." Regeneration and not baptism is the soul of a Baptist church. These democratic bodies agree with Dr. Jacob, of the Church of England, who says, in his "Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament" (p. 270): "Notwithstanding all that has been written by learned men upon this subject, it remains indisputable that infant baptism is not mentioned in the New Testament. No instance of it is recorded there; no allusion is made to its effects; no directions are given for its administration. However reasonably we may be convinced that we find in the Christian Scriptures 'the fundamental idea from which infant baptism was afterward developed' and by which it may now be justified; it ought to be distinctly acknowledged that it is not an apostolic ordinance."

THOMAS ARMITAGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DRURY'S BLUFF AND PETERSBURG.

MAY AND JUNE, 1864.

I.

In the early spring of 1864, General Grant was appointed Commander in Chief of all the Federal armies in the field. The attention and hopes of the North were centred upon him. He was believed to be the one Federal General who could eventually succeed in crushing the "rebellion." Other military leaders, of high repute, had been intrusted with the task now devolving upon him and had failed. But, though "he saw how terrible was the crisis, not only for himself, but far more for the country,"* he accepted none the less the weight of this new responsibility.

From that time to the close of the war, the State of Virginia became once more the main theatre of the great struggle which had lasted upwards of three years between the two sections of the country. The cry of "On to Richmond" again re-echoed throughout the North, and caused almost superhuman efforts to be made, both in Washington and in the field, to accomplish the destruction of the "rebel" capital, and thus break, once for all, the backbone of the Confederacy.

The outline of the coming federal campaign was that General Sherman should make immediate preparations for an advance against General Johnston's army, at or near Dalton, Georgia; that General Meade, still nominally in command of the Army of the Potomac, should at the same time, and from his base north of the Rapidan, start upon the resolute, but hazardous, march projected against General Lee; and that General Butler, with the Tenth Corps under General Gillmore, lately summoned from the neighborhood of Charleston, should operate simultaneously on the southern bank of the James, and threaten both Petersburg and Richmond; the two latter armies so to combine their respective

* "Military History of U. S. Grant," by General Badeau, Vol. II., Chap. xv., p. 5.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movements, as, in case of need, to become "a unit on the James." *

When General Grant finally took the field in person, with headquarters at Culpeper, some fourteen or fifteen miles from the Rapidan, the federal forces with General Meade amounted to about one hundred and twenty thousand men of all arms, reinforced not long afterwards by the arrival of the Ninth Corps, numbering some twenty thousand more. Just about that time the army of Northern Virginia consisted of very nearly sixty-four thousand effectives. The only reinforcements received later on by General Lee amounted to a little over fourteen thousand men; thus swelling his forces "to seventy-eight thousand four hundred as the aggregate of all troops engaged under him from the Wilderness to Cold Harbor." †

With so great a disparity in the strength of these two opposing hosts, it was easy to perceive that even the army of Northern Virginia, inured as it was to victory, would be unequal to the task now before it, which required unremitting vigilance at two separate and distant points. In order, therefore, to allow General Lee to give his full attention to the large and thoroughly equipped army persistently moving upon him, it became necessary to obtain other troops from other quarters of the Confederacy, to resist the threatened incursions of General Butler's forces.

It was in part execution of such a course that, after some preliminary correspondence between the War Department and myself, the following order was issued:

RICHMOND, *April 15th*, 1864.

GENERAL G. T. BEAUREGARD:

Repair with least delay practicable to Weldon, N. C., where instructions will be sent to you.

S. COOPER,
Adjt. and Insp. Gen'l.

My successor in the Department of South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida was Major-Gen. Sam Jones. He arrived in Charleston on the 19th. I gave him all the information I deemed necessary, under the circumstances, and left the next day, reaching Weldon on the 22d, at 5:30 o'clock A. M.

Charleston was quiet at that time. The enemy had been ordered to discontinue his exhaustive and fruitless effort to reduce

* "Military History of Ulysses S. Grant," by General Badeau, Vol., II. Chap. xv., p. 34.

† "Four Years with General Lee," by Col. W. H. Taylor, p. 137.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it. General Gillmore and his forces were about to be sent to increase the strength of General Butler on the line selected for his operations on the James. In fact, the attention of the entire country, North and South, was now riveted upon the advance of the Army of the Potomac, with General Grant to guide it, against the Army of Northern Virginia, led by General Lee. The instructions promised me from Richmond were received on the 23d. On that day I assumed command of what was termed the Department of North Carolina and Southern Virginia. It included "Virginia, south of the James and Appomatox, and all that portion of North Carolina east of the mountains." *

The War Department was closely engaged at that time with certain operations against Plymouth and Newbern, from which great results were expected at Richmond, but about which the enemy was not much concerned, as the main object of his campaign could, in no wise, be affected or seriously disturbed by such a diversion. I did not consider this move judicious on the part of the Government, because, irrespective of other considerations, it occasioned an untimely division of some of the most available troops in my new command, rendering their immediate concentration at any threatened point very difficult, if not impossible. The destination of General Burnside's corps was not, as yet, well defined. The opinion was entertained by many that it would march upon Richmond *via* Petersburg. Others thought its aim was Weldon. In either hypothesis we should have been prepared to meet the assault in time, and, clearly, we were not. In telegrams sent by me, on the 25th of April, to General Bragg, then acting as Chief of Staff of the Confederate armies, I said : "Are we prepared to resist General Burnside ? Can the forces of this department be concentrated in time ? These are questions worthy of immediate attention." I added that, in my opinion, it was not prudent to allow the forces of the Department to be "so scattered ;" and that the object in view (the Plymouth and Newbern raid) "was hardly worth the risk incurred."†

As a matter of fact, when the Ninth Corps, under General Burnside, came from East Tennessee, it simply went to increase the strength of the Army of the Potomac. General Grant, it

* "Military Operations of General Beauregard," Vol. II., Chap. xxxv., p. 195.

† See telegrams referred to in "Military Operations of General Beauregard," Vol. II., Chap. xxxv., p. 196.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appears, never intended to move it separately against Richmond, nor to order it "to lead an expedition in North Carolina." But the forces under General Butler, with the addition of the corps commanded by General Gillmore and by General Smith, amounted to about 30,000 men, and were evidently being prepared for a determined advance upon Petersburg. Thus was the projected co-operation of Mead's and Butler's armies to be inaugurated. This gave the clue of the situation to the immediate advisers of President Davis. They realized, at last, the uselessness of the Plymouth and Newbern expedition; and orders came, one hurriedly following the other, instructing me to withdraw General Hoke and his forces from the outworks of Newbern, which they had already taken, and to rush them on to protect Richmond. "There is not an hour to lose," said Mr. Davis in one of his telegrams to me. "Had the expedition not started, I would say it should not go."*

Other troops were also being ordered from other directions, and notably from South Carolina, to assist in the defense of the Confederate Capital. First, Hagood's brigade; next, Wise's; and soon afterwards, Colquitt's. So great was the anxiety of the administration at this juncture that Hagood's brigade, which General Picket, then in command of Petersburg, desired to halt on its passage through that city, was ordered to be pushed on to Richmond without an instant's delay.† I succeeded, however, in having that order rescinded, and General Hagood was thus enabled to baffle General Butler's forces, May 6 and 7, in their assault upon the Richmond Railroad above Petersburg. General Bushrod Johnson, who had hurried from Drury's Bluff to take part in this action, was of material assistance, although, from the position he occupied with his troops, his services were less conspicuous. Petersburg would have inevitably fallen into the hands of the enemy had not General Hagood been halted there at that most opportune hour. The Federal loss was computed at about one thousand men. Ours was quite insignificant. General Hagood and his command became the heroes of the day, and were justly looked upon as the saviors of Petersburg on that occasion. They had nobly inaugurated their first appearance on the soil of Virginia.

* Telegram from Mr. Davis to General Beauregard, May 4th, 1864.
† Telegram from General Bragg to General Beauregard, May 5th, 1864.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The enemy, after this repulse, appeared to have relinquished all idea of striking another immediate blow at Petersburg, and seemed now to be aiming more directly at Richmond. I was pressingly urged to leave Weldon and repair to Petersburg, where all my available forces were being concentrated, with a view to to-operate with General Ransom for the defense of the Capital. But, rapid as were the movements of our troops, withdrawn from North Carolina and other points, their celerity failed to satisfy or reassure the War Department, whose trepidation grew hourly more intense, and whose orders, telegrams, and suggestions became as harassing as they were numerous.

The incursion of the enemy's cavalry at Jarratt's, and the burning of Stony Creek bridge, prevented me from reaching Petersburg before the 10th of May. General Hoke also arrived on that day. He was placed by me at the head of our advancing column, consisting of six brigades of infantry and eight batteries of artillery, and began an immediate march towards Drury's Bluff, with orders to form there, or thereabouts, as early a junction as practicable with Major-General Ransom's forces.

As other troops were still coming in from Weldon and elsewhere, whose organization and assignment to duty I thought best to personally supervise, I concluded not to follow on with the forces under General Hoke and to await the arrival of General Whiting, then on his way from Wilmington. He had been ordered to Petersburg to take charge of the troops in that city and its vicinity, and to relieve General Pickett, who had reported himself ill, and was unable, for the time being, to perform any duty in the field.

Drury's Bluff was in imminent peril; so were the avenues leading from it to Richmond. General Butler, as already stated, had some thirty thousand men with him, and, with him, also, were two efficient and highly-esteemed officers—General Gillmore and General Smith—superior in every respect, save, perhaps, in dates of commission, to their commanding general. The main, if not the only, chance in our favor, at that critical juncture, lay in the probability—almost an accomplished fact already—that General Butler would not seek the advice of his subordinates, and would thus lose sight of and neglect the opportunities that stared him in the face and weighed so heavily against us. That he did evince hesitancy, timidity, and inefficiency on that occasion is un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deniable, and is testified to by General Halleck, who, in one of his dispatches to General Grant, with regard to Butler's operations at that time, expressed himself as follows: "Butler is falling back. Don't rely on him." *

General Whiting reached Petersburg on the 13th. After briefly explaining to him what my intentions were, and what I expected him to do, should I assume command at Drury's Bluff, and give the enemy battle there, I left for the front, taking with me some twelve hundred men of Colquitt's Brigade and Baker's regiment of cavalry.

The road was beset with difficulties; and it was by mere chance that I succeeded in passing safely between the enemy's extreme left and the river. Our exterior lines had already been attacked and partially carried by some of Butler's forces. It was three o'clock in the morning when I arrived at Drury's Bluff. Without a moment's delay, I held a consultation with Colonel Harris and Colonel Stevens. The former was my Chief Engineer, a tried and most efficient officer, who served on my staff from the first Manassas up to the time of his death, which took place on the 10th of October, 1864. The second was also an able engineer on duty in and around Richmond. They acquainted me with the exact state of affairs in our immediate front, and described the encounter of the previous evening between part of Butler's forces and ours. The outlook was not encouraging, although the damage incurred might have been more serious, and even General Butler, I thought, could, under the circumstances, have done better. Colonel Stevens had also given me, that morning, a succinct account of the last engagements between General Lee and General Grant, up to the 12th, and of the relative position of their two armies. Nor, in enumerating the strength then available for the protection of Richmond, had he omitted to mention a reserve force of some five thousand men stationed in and near the Capital, and acting, at that time, as a separate command. I was thus made conversant with many a fact which greatly assisted me in forming a more correct opinion of the situation before us. Colonel Stevens had likewise furnished me with a topographical map of that portion of Virginia covered by the Confederate forces. Upon carefully examining it I saw that, as

* "Military History of U. S. Grant," by General Badeau, Vol. II., Chap. xvii., p. 200.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Lee's army and my forces were "on nearly" a right line passing through Richmond, with General Grant's army on the left, and Butler's on the right, we still held the interior lines; and that it were possible, by prompt and decisive action, and a combined movement on our part, first, to attack and defeat Butler, and next, to turn our entire forces against General Grant. I hurriedly formed a plan to that effect, and sent Colonel Stevens to Richmond for the purpose of submitting it to Mr. Davis, and of asking his consent to carry it out.

Mr. Davis could not be seen; but Colonel Stevens saw General Bragg, who thought the plan a good one, and came at once to Drury's Bluff to confer with me.

I proposed that General Lee, who was said to be, at that time, near Guinea Station, should at once move back "to the defensive lines of the Chickahominy, or even to the intermediate lines of Richmond;"* that a force of ten thousand men be detached from his army and sent to me without the loss of an hour, if possible; that the five thousand men kept near Richmond, under Major-General Ransom, be also ordered to report promptly to me. I stated that these forces, added to mine, would give me an effective of some twenty-five thousand men with whom, on the very next day, or as soon thereafter as practicable, I would attack Butler's right flank, with the almost certainty of separating him from his base at Bermuda Hundred, and of thus obtaining an easy victory over him. I proposed also, as an essential feature to the entire success of my plan, that, while this movement would be in progress, General Whiting, with all his available forces at Petersburg, amounting to about four thousand men, should march from Port Walthal Junction and fall upon Butler's right rear, forcing him to the very banks of James River, somewhat abreast of Drury's Bluff, and, by this manœuvre, insure his unconditional surrender. And I proposed, furthermore, that, with my own forces, added to those temporarily taken from the Army of Northern Virginia and the environs of Richmond, I should cross the James, after disposing of Butler, and, "by a concerted movement, strike General Grant on his left flank, while General Lee should attack him in front."*

General Bragg, who certainly knew where and at what distance from Drury's Bluff was General Lee's army at that moment, gave

* "Military Operations of General Beauregard," Vol. II., Chap. xxxv., p. 201.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his unreserved approval to the plan thus submitted to him. He never said, nor did he intimate in any way, that the reinforcements I desired from the Army of Northern Virginia would not be able to reach Drury's Bluff in time. He simply stated that, while concurring with me as to the feasibility of the movement, he could not command its execution without first consulting the President, and he hurried back to Richmond for the purpose of seeing him and of urging a favorable decision of the measure.

Mr. Davis arrived in person between eight and nine o'clock that morning. He found me in the Drury House, not at my "headquarters in the field," as he was pleased to say in his book; for I had as yet established no headquarters in the field or elsewhere. As a matter of fact, I had not even assumed command of the forces, nor had I seen General Hoke, who, expecting another attack from General Butler, was just then busily engaged along his lines. The President was all bespattered with mud, which indicated how rapidly he had ridden from Richmond to Drury's Bluff. I was in hopes that such great haste on his part would prove of good omen for my plan, but I was not long before realizing my error.

He listened to me with grave attention, and I did all in my power to convince him, not only of the advisability of my plan, but of its absolute necessity at that juncture. The substance of his reply was, that he could not be reconciled to the idea of ordering the Army of Virginia to fall back before the Army of the Potomac. That such a manœuvre would destroy the prestige of those heroic troops, and create a feeling of distrust among the people which no after-event could mitigate or redeem. I remarked to him that, however painful the fact might be, it was evident that the Army of Virginia, though still a barrier to the Army of the Potomac, and resolutely facing it wherever it moved, was none the less forcibly losing ground before it, and that the latter was gradually and surely approaching its objective point—Richmond. That in my opinion, it were better for General Lee to take a voluntary step rearward through motives of strategy, and with a view to foil the designs of his adversary, as I proposed he should do, than to maintain the passive defensive, and to merely follow the movements of the enemy, without making any possible headway against him. I added that the confidence of the people, far from being impaired by the carrying out

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of such a plan, would, on the contrary, be enhanced by it, as its plain result would be concentration, not retreat; and that concentration was, for us at this crisis, the surest—if not the only—assurance of victory. But I argued in vain. Mr. Davis adhered to his former determination, and would only agree to send me the five thousand men under Ransom, of whom mention has already been made. They joined my forces on the evening of the 15th.

In the meantime, my command had been extended "so as to include Drury's Bluff and its defenses," * which it did not before my conference with Mr. Davis. I was also expected to protect Richmond, and "to meet any sudden move against the city on the north side." †

But Mr. Davis had also objected to the co-operation of General Whiting, which formed a salient feature of my plan, because, as alleged in his book "of the hazard during a battle of attempting to make a junction of troops moving from opposite sides of the enemy." ‡ How often do those whose official position permits the rejection of sagacious, if perilous, tactics, lose sight of the fact that "war is essentially a contest of chances, and he who fears to encounter any risk seldom accomplishes great results!" I reluctantly yielded to the "*distinct objection*" of the President and Commander-in-Chief of our armies, and, at his request, changed General Whiting's order of march from Petersburg. But, when realizing that Ransom's forces would only join me on the evening of the 15th, and that the enemy was already "erecting batteries and rifle-pits" around Drury's Bluff, I saw how important it was to attack Butler the very next morning; and, in pursuance of my original plan, after informing the President of the fact,§ on the 15th, at 10:45 A. M., I sent the following telegram to General Whiting:

"I shall attack enemy to-morrow at daylight by river road, to cut him off from his Bermuda base. You will take up your position to-night on Swift Creek, with Wise's, Martin's, Dearing's, and two regiments of Colquitt's brigades, with about twenty pieces under Colonel Jones. At daybreak you will march to Port Walthal Junction; and when you hear an engagement in your front you will advance boldly and rapidly, by the shortest road, in direction of heaviest firing, to attack enemy in rear or flank. You will protect your advance and flanks with

* Telegram from Richmond, dated May 14th, 1864, from T. Rowland, A. A. G.

† General Bragg's telegram of same date.

‡ "Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government," Vol. II., p. 512.

§ "Military Operations of General Beauregard," Vol. II., Chap. XXXV., p. 218.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dearing's cavalry, taking necessary precautions to distinguish friends from foes. Please communicate this to General Hill. This revokes all former orders of movements."

"P. S. I have just received a telegram from General Bragg, informing me that he has sent you orders to join me at this place; you need not do so, but follow to the letter the above instructions."

This was sufficiently clear. But, to avoid all possible misconstruction of the real import of the telegram, I intrusted it to General (then Colonel) Logan, of the "Hampton Legion," temporarily on duty with me as one of my staff. I also gave him, for General Whiting, a rough copy of my order of battle for the next day. He delivered these papers during the night of the 15th, as he testifies to in a letter to me bearing on this point, where he adds that "General Whiting read the dispatches, expressed himself as understanding them entirely, and gave orders for the advance of his entire force by daylight the next morning." *

My object was to separate Butler from his base and capture his whole army, if possible. The active co-operation of Whiting was, I thought, indispensable to attain such an end.

I organized my forces into three divisions, under Hoke, Ransom, and Colquitt, and called these officers to my headquarters to explain to them the part I expected each and all to play in the impending attack. General Ransom was ordered to attack the Federal right flank at daybreak, to drive back the skirmishers in his front, and, following almost simultaneously with his entire force, to pivot at the proper time, and strike the enemy's flank and rear. His formation was to be in two distinct lines, supported by artillery and by Colonel Dunnovant's regiment of cavalry.

General Hoke, who occupied the trenches on the right of Ransom, was also to engage the enemy at daybreak with a strong line of skirmishers, and, upon causing him to fall back or waver, was to push on the whole of his command, and clear his entire front with rapidity and vigor. His orders were, likewise, to form in two lines, at an interval of four hundred yards, and abreast of the trenches, but in such a way as not to impede any of his after movements. The use to be made of the artillery attached to his division and of Boyken's regiment of cavalry, was left to his own judgment.

* "Military Operations of General Beauregard," Vol. II., Chap. xxxv., p. 558.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Colquitt's command constituted the reserve. It was composed of the only troops which I personally knew, and which had already served under me. They were ordered to form rearward of General Hoke's forces, "with the centre of each brigade resting on the turnpike." Their first line was to be some five hundred yards distant from Hoke's second line. The artillery attached to that division was "to follow along the turnpike about three hundred yards in rear of the last brigade."

General Whiting, with Wise's, Martin's and Dearing's commands, with two regiments of Colquitt's brigade, and twenty pieces of artillery under Colonel Jones, was to move from Petersburg, along the Petersburg and Richmond turnpike, and to strike the enemy's flank and rear, as already explained.

The substance of the above, thus orally given to the three Division Commanders then with me at Drury's Bluff, was also contained in a written circular delivered to each of them—as it had been previously outlined to General Whiting—so that none could be taken by surprise, no matter what movements might be executed the next day on the different parts of the field.

General Ransom began his advance at a quarter to five o'clock A. M., but was much retarded by a dense fog of several hours' duration. He had with him Gracie's brigade, Kemper's, under Colonel Ferry, Burton's, under Colonel Fry, and Hoke's old brigade, commanded by Colonel Lewis.

At six o'clock A. M., he had carried the enemy's breastworks in his front, taking, it was claimed—but this was afterwards seriously contested—several stands of colors and some five hundred prisoners. His troops had behaved with acknowledged gallantry; Gracie's and Kemper's commands being mostly engaged, and the former turning the enemy's right flank. But, for the purpose, it is alleged, of re-establishing his line and procuring a fresh supply of ammunition, Ransom now came to a halt, and, reporting "his loss heavy and his troops scattered by the fog," called for immediate assistance. At 6:30, Colquitt's brigade, or such portion of it as was then present,* went to reinforce Ransom, with orders to resume its former position as soon as no longer needed. Just at that time General Ransom, upon being informed, as he alleged, that the enemy was driving Hoke's left, sent forward the right

* Two regiments of that command were still at or near Petersburg with General Whiting.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regiment of Lewis's brigade, which effectually checked the Federal advance until the reserve brigade came up and drove it back from our left centre to the turnpike, over and beyond our works. General Ransom was wrong in believing Hoke's left in danger. His error lay in the fact that one of Hagood's advanced regiments, having unexpectedly come across the enemy, had been ordered back so as to give Ransom time to bring around his own left, in conformity with the order of battle already explained.

The relative confusion and lull which followed these ill-timed evolutions necessitated a slight change in the original movement, in order, as stated in my report, "to relieve Hoke, on whose front the enemy had been allowed to mass his forces by the inaction of the left." Ransom was ordered to change the front of his right brigade and support it by another, to be drawn in *échelon;* then to push forward a third brigade towards Proctor's Creek and to keep a fourth one in reserve. This was to be temporary only, and the plan, as originally adopted, was to be executed as soon as we had taken possession of the river and of Proctor's Creek crossing. But the reserve brigade was already engaged with the enemy, and Ransom's own forces were advancing towards the firing of the centre. He could not, therefore, carry out the order given to him, and sent back Barton's instead of Colquitt's brigade; reporting, meanwhile, the necessity of straightening the lines he had stormed, and expressing the belief that the safety of his command would be compromised by a further advance. Here ended the services of General Ransom and of his infantry on that day; for, upon receiving the disappointing and unexpected report of the alleged situation in his front, I had ordered him to halt where he then was "until further arrangements should be made" to relieve him. His cavalry, however, and his artillery, also, continued to do their full share of the work before them. The cavalry, under Dunnovant, being dismounted, was deployed as skirmishers against a force occupying the ridge of Gregory's woods, the only hostile force—as afterwards ascertained—which threatened the left of our line at that time. The right was seriously engaged; and there, early in the morning, Hoke had pushed on his skirmishers and freely used his artillery. The fog was an impediment for him, as it had been for Ransom, but he had none the less handled his command with that resolution and judgment for which he was so conspicuous.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I now quote from my official report of the battle :

"Hagood and Johnson were thrown forward with a section of Eschelman's Washington Artillery, and found a heavy force of the enemy, with six or eight pieces of artillery, occupying the salient of the outer line of works on the turnpike and his own defensive lines.

"Our artillery engaged at very short range, disabling some of the enemy's guns and blowing up two limbers. Another section of the same command opened from the right of the turnpike. They both held their positions, though with heavy loss, until their ammunition was spent, when they were relieved by an equal number of pieces from the reserve artillery, under Major Owen.

"Hagood, with great vigor and dash, drove the enemy from the outer lines in his front, capturing a number of prisoners, and, in conjunction* with Johnson, five pieces of artillery—three 20-pounder Parrotts, and two fine Napoleons. He then took position in the works, his left regiment being thrown forward by Hoke to connect with Ransom's right. In advancing, his regiment encountered the enemy behind a second line of works in the woods, with abatis, interlaced with wire. Attack at that point not being contemplated, it was ordered back to the line of battle, but not before its intrepid advance had brought on it considerable loss. This circumstance has been referred to before, as the occasion of a mistake by Ransom.

"Johnson, meanwhile, had been heavily engaged. The line of the enemy bent around his right flank, subjecting his brigade, for a time, to fire in flank and front. With admirable firmness he repulsed frequent assaults of the enemy, moving in masses against his right and rear. Leader, officers, and men alike, displayed their fitness for the trial to which they were subjected. I cannot forbear to mention that Lieutenant Waggoner, of the 17th Tennessee Regiment, went alone through a storm of fire and pulled down a white flag which a small, isolated body of our men had raised, receiving a wound in the act. The brigade, holding its ground nobly, lost more than a fourth of its entire number."

I hurried two regiments of the reserve to its support, but they were not properly posted by the officer leading them, and afforded but little assistance. Two regiments of Clingman's brigade were likewise sent by General Hoke to reinforce Johnson's left. They, also, failed to accomplish the object for which they were pressed forward. Seeing which, I now ordered Hoke to relieve his right centre with his right ; and, Clingman's remaining regiments and Corse's whole brigade being used by him for that purpose, the enemy was soon forced to give way before them. A gap intervening between the troops on the left of Clingman and his own command, led him to fall back to prevent a flank movement, thus isolating Corse, who, believing his right flank seriously menaced, retreated almost simultaneously, but not as far back as he was

* It was afterwards claimed—and General Hoke confirmed the claim—that Hagood's brigade alone—with the assistance of no other command—captured these five pieces of artillery ; the only ones taken by our troops from the enemy on that day.—G. T. B.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when first ordered to move forward. These two commands participated but little in the succeeding events of the day, though both were afterwards marched again to the front, and gave evidence of their readiness to perform any duty that might be required of them. The enemy, however, did not reoccupy the ground from which Corse and Clingman had compelled him to retire, but held his own, none the less, with much stubbornness in Hagood's and Johnson's front; and, though giving way to Johnson's right, succeeded in securing a good position abreast of Proctor's Creek, near the turnpike, and also at the "Charles Friend" House. But General Johnson, with the timely assistance of the Washington Artillery, finally drove back the opposing forces from his right flank, and was thus enabled to clear his entire front. One of the pieces captured was now used against the enemy, who gave way beyond the Proctor Creek ridge, leaving but a skirmish line to keep up the appearance of a continuous contest. I took advantage of this somewhat unexpected lull in the movements of the enemy. 1, To inquire into the whereabouts of General Whiting, the sound of whose guns was said to have been heard at 1:45 P. M., but who had given no further sign of an early junction with our forces; and 2d, To reorganize our lines, in order to present a more united front, were the enemy to show a desire to resume the offensive. No news came of Whiting. The only portion of his force which communicated with me on the 16th was a detachment of Dearing's command, acting as an escort to General Logan, one of the bearers the day previous of my instructions to General Whiting, who had come, with the utmost celerity and through great danger, to inform me "that I need not rely on any advance being made that day by General Whiting." From him I also learned that Dearing, impatient at his commander's tardiness to obey my orders, and desirous of accelerating General Logan's return to me, had encountered the enemy's pickets near Chester, and had gallantly driven them in, forcing them back "as far as the Half-way Station" and capturing a large number of stragglers; that there was great demoralization among the Federal troops; that nothing would have prevented Whiting from capturing "the entire force of General Butler," had he followed my instructions, for he would have met with but slight resistance, if any, while endeavoring to do so.

I already knew that all hope of Whiting's junction with me

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that day was to be abandoned. But the assurance of General Logan as to the facility with which my orders could have been successfully carried out, had they been partially obeyed, caused me the keenest regret, and compelled me to give up "so much of my plan as contemplated more than a vigorous pursuit of Butler, and driving him to his fortified base."*

I ordered the original formation of our lines to be resumed, and General Hoke was directed to send two regiments along the "Court-House Road" to flank the enemy at that point, if possible, and erect enfilading batteries west of the railroad. A heavy storm of rain now came on, which very much retarded the movement. The enemy had opened a telling fire upon us just at that moment, but it took us very little time to silence it. Darkness prevented a further advance that evening. Butler's entrenched camp was too near and too many obstacles might have been met with to justify any unguarded move on my part. I therefore halted the troops for the night, and sent word to General Whiting that I expected his co-operation, early the next morning, at the railroad, on the right of our line.

We had defeated Butler and forced him to take refuge within his fortified lines. The communications south and west of Richmond were restored. We had achieved the main object for which our forces had encountered the enemy. But, though unable, for the present, to do us any harm; though hemmed in, or "*bottled up*," as was said of him at that time, he was none the less there, scarcely beyond cannon shot of us; not much weakened in number, for, during the progress of the fight, we had only taken some fourteen hundred prisoners, five pieces of artillery, and five stand of colors. We could, and should have, done more. We could, and should have, captured Butler's entire army.

In General Hagood's sober and accurate account of the battle of Drury's Bluff, contained in what I take to be his unedited memoirs of that period of the war, a copy of which I have before me, is found the following passage:

"After the war, the Federal General Ames told General Hagood, that during the evening and night when Butler's routed and disorganized column was defiling within a mile of Whiting's five thousand men of all arms, but a thin skirmish line intervened between them and destruction."

Incomplete, however, as was the result of the Confederate vic-

* From my official report of the battle of Drury's Bluff.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tory at Drury's Bluff, it had thwarted and annulled the main object of Butler's presence at Bermuda Hundred, and his expected co-operation, later on, with General Grant. It had destroyed the effectiveness of his whole army, and, as General Badeau correctly asserts in his "Military History of U. S. Grant," it had "absolutely put an end to Butler's campaign."

It is useless to speculate on what might have taken place had the ten thousand men from General Lee's army been sent to Drury's Bluff, and had they taken part in the battle of the 16th. With such a conjunction of our forces, the result would not have been doubtful. But my only endeavor is to show here what actually happened. General Whiting joined me on the 17th near mid-day. He was thoroughly downcast. No word was spoken by him, and no attempt made to throw off the responsibility of his failure to unite his forces to mine the day previous. He admitted the error of which he had been guilty, and expressed most heartfelt regret. At his own request he was relieved from duty in the field, and returned to the command of his department. His after conduct during the closing scenes of the war, and his heroic death at Fort Fisher, contributed largely to reinstate him in the good opinion of his comrades-in-arms and of the entire South.

The forces just arrived from Petersburg had scarcely been put in position, when, by order of the War Department, and against my protest, the whole of Ransom's division was withdrawn from Drury's Bluff, and marched back to Richmond. I was then pursuing the enemy, and still driving him nearer and nearer to his base. Fortunately for us, his rout of the 16th had been such as to preclude, on his part, all thought of any determined resistance. He was clearly demoralized, if not destroyed, and his main object seemed to be to reach a secure position, and shield himself from all further pursuit. He was successful in that, if in no other feature of his plan. General Grant, who fully understood Butler's actual position with respect to mine, took immediate advantage of the fact, and caused Smith's entire corps, numbering some sixteen thousand men, to be transferred from the Army of the James to the Army of the Potomac. Butler winced under the order, but obeyed. This reduced his force at Bermuda Hundred to about thirteen thousand. To oppose it I could command not more than twelve thousand men. The difference was insignificant; but it must be remembered that the Federal commander possessed many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an advantage which I had not, and that, notwithstanding his defeat and the drain made upon him, he could, and eventually did continue to threaten General Lee's communications with his main sources of supply through Richmond and Petersburg, thereby constantly endangering both of these cities. For that reason I considered it unwise to send reinforcements to the Army of Northern Virginia, as the War Department was already pressing me to do so. Nor could I, later on, accept the proposition of General Lee to leave a sufficient guard for the purpose of watching Butler's movements, and, with the rest of my command, move to the north side of the James, to lead the right wing of his army.

But the War Department, in its great anxiety to increase the strength of the Army of Northern Virginia, readily yielded to the applications of its distinguished commander, and my force was thus materially weakened by the withdrawal "of most of the troops that had been directly engaged under me in the battle of Drury's Bluff."* So far, indeed—in spite of my numerous objections—had this process of injudicious reduction been carried, that I was finally left with a portion only of Bushrod Johnson's Division—say 3,200 men—and Wise's Brigade, with 2,200 more, including the local militia, making in all some 5,400 men, with whom I was expected to protect, not only the Bermuda Hundred line, but also the City of Petersburg, and, to a certain extent, even Richmond itself! Nor should I omit to mention here, that fully one-third of that force had to be kept unremittingly on picket duty.

G. T. BEAUREGARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR KING IN DRESS COAT.

II.

THE philosophical basis of Democracy is the comparative incorruptibility of the larger number. The lone wayfarer by night may be alarmed at the approach of one or two men, but does not fear a multitude. The mass will be honest. And this mass is not a herd. For one thing, it can co-operate effectively for a mentally comprehended purpose, as a herd cannot. The huge boulder which supports the equestrian statue of Peter the Great at St. Petersburg lay for a long time on a plain some miles out of the city. When it was desired to get it on rollers and draw it to the city many horses were attached to the boulder, but they could not move it; the horses had not sufficient intelligence to obey a signal and combine their power perfectly at a given moment. For this men were required. A large number of serfs were hitched to the rock; a band of music was provided to inspire them with martial strains; the Czar moved before them, the priests at their side; at the sound of a gun their force was concentrated; the huge boulder was raised on the rollers, and by a series of marches drawn by the men into St. Petersburg. But if this illustration shows the strength of the masses, it also recalls their weakness. After all, it is a boulder lifted by serfs to sustain the effigy of their master on his prancing steed. Their combined force is under sway of the banners, the cymbals, the dazzling splendors of "the man on horseback;" their chain is the superstition that he is the visible representative of God. That procession of harnessed men moves through history: they grow more enlightened; they lift political and religious boulders; they lift the despot, the priest; but whatever be the boulder lifted it is sure in the end to support some mounted master. The English lifted the Stuart boulder for Cromwell to stand on and massacre the Irish. The French removed the power of Louis XVI. to make a pedestal for Robespierre; they lifted Robespierre to make

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a throne for Bonaparte, whose little finger was heavier than the loins of Louis and Robespierre combined; later they lifted the Louis Philippe boulder and set up Louis Napoleon. In America, the people lifted the stony weight of British monarchy and set up a presidential imperialism. They have now lifted the crushing boulder of slavery. They have shown their power to combine and concentrate their strength enough to move the heaviest and most deeply set oppression. But it was still done by the forces of the militant age,—with drum and fife, under banners,—and their achievement was made into a higher pedestal for the presidential Commander-in-Chief. The "man on horseback" asked a third term; and if any equally strong and popular military president should insist upon it, he will find in some powers exercised for suppression of the rebellion and reconstruction of the Union precedents for his purpose. It is proposed to strip the presidency of some of its privileges and powers,—such as re-eligibility, and control of the civil and military service. But a President, unable to prolong his power legally, will have additional temptation to prolong it illegally. Like the pluralist in the "Mikado," he may feel himself compelled to do as Commander-in-Chief, what, as Chief Magistrate, he will deplore. Any popular disturbance may supply him with cause to prohibit the usual election, on Garfield's principle, that "we have a right to do our solemn duty, under God, to go beyond the Constitution to save the authors of the Constitution." If men like Cromwell, like Louis Napoleon and others have so done in the Old World, why may it not be done in the New? Things as illegal have been done here, sometimes for good, sometimes for evil purposes; the extra-constitutional measures of Lincoln for the country supplied Johnson with his weapons against the country. These weapons remain in the executive armory; a fanatic, with the popularity and pluck of Jackson, might re-elect himself without ballots. To abolish presidential re-eligibility were to invite the *coup d'état*. To prolong the presidential term were to invite revolution by a fixedness of administrative policy which, if discredited and dangerous, might do in seven years what could not be undone in a hundred. And as for the Civil Service reformers, what would their complete success do for the executive? For every office removed from his control a responsibility is taken from his shoulders. Cut off his civilian fingers, then his arms, finally his legs; supply other arms

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and legs from the senatorial manufactory, and you drive him either to depend on his military arms or to aggrandize his social magnificence. More probably it would be both, and the White House become the grand *salon* of snobs and decorated courtiers. When this period arrives our securest plan would be to import the Prince of Wales and offer him our presidency in perpetuity; for his training under the constitutional reign of his mother, amid domestic peace, has been healthier than that of presidential aspirants trained under the flags of a long array of military presidents, and our worst danger would be from the army of professional beauties, and the cost of masquerade uniforms supplied by the costumer. I am serious in this. And I here cite the opinion of the ripest student and representative of the republican principle who ever lived—Louis Blanc. I translate from an article by him in the *Nouveau Monde,* 1849, "De la Présidence dans une République :"

"Presidency is an institution which can become more baleful than royalty itself. Monarchy baffles ambitions; Presidency prevails by setting them in motion and exasperating them. He whom birth calls to a throne does not have to open a road for himself across an agitated people. His need of tools costs neither factious attempt nor bloody effort. The lot which releases him from the need to merit power by virtues, also releases him from the need of acquiring it by intrigues. Without having to disquiet himself, without need of devices, he sees approaching a crowd eager to obey. Why seize by ruse or violence what he possesses without even extending his hand? Fortune has undertaken to supply him partisans in advance; he finds them pressing around his cradle; he has begun to reign in his mother's womb. Fantastic conventionalism, certainly! A conventionalism humilitating to the human species, but which at least cannot trouble the society it debases. In the canvass for presidency there is nothing of that kind. Here success can be the prize only of prodigious efforts. In the midst of a society where interests are very diverse, and relations complex, distinguished merit, unquestionable services, a well-founded popularity, will not always constitute sufficient chances. It is then necessary to eke them out by force of skill and audacity; it will be necessary to calumniate rivals, to make ignominous advances to former enemies, to sacrifice friends to partisans, the sacred rights of justice to the violence of majorities; it will be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessary to add to the echo of his name the noise of a thousand venal clamors, to accept fraudulent engagements; to open for all parties, fawned on in turn, deceitful prospects, to create a train of subordinate ambitions, an environment of false leaders; to lose self-respect for the suffrage of others, and stoop to become the master; *omnia serviliter pro dominatione.* When the heir of a monarch reaches the crown, no one finds himself humiliated. The event was foreseen; this is not the victory of one man over another; it is the triumph of an insolent abstraction at which the philosopher is indignant, which the publicist condemns, but which does not wound the ambitious. It may, perhaps, be a misfortune for all; for no one is it an offense. Even the mediocrity of a prince, if it is recognized, pleases the statesmen; they are consoled for having a chief; involuntarily placed under one elected by accident, their high-spirited minds indemnify with disdain the necessity of submission. When it comes to be one elected by a people, what a difference! Superiority of rank, able to establish that of merit, in this case establishes between the most distinguished men a strife in which self-love is naturally called to play an implacable part. The passions of the chiefs traverse society. I am not among those who excuse, or even comprehend, monarchical superstitions. But it is only just to recognize that what, under the constitutional régime, royalists honor in their king, is an idea rather than an individual. Well! human dignity has less to lose by worship of a principle than by worship of a man, however false the principle and however grand the man."

I have a letter, received from Louis Blanc fifteen years ago, in which he says: "At the time when Louis Napoleon Bonaparte was coming forward as a candidate for the Presidential office, I thought it my duty to point out the direful consequences likely to flow from the election of a President. The solemn warning I then gave to my countrymen was expressed as follows: 'Whenever a man and an Assembly stand face to face, that Assembly brings with it a 10 Août, and that man has behind him an 18 Brumaire.' But as you have rightly observed, there are political as well as religious superstitions, nor are the former more easily uprooted than the latter. At the time alluded to, it seemed next to impossible that there should be a Republic without a President. A strange aberration this—more especially on the part of the French, as they had been taught by experience

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how readily a President or Consul is turned into an Emperor. However, the warning was disregarded, and on the 2d of December we had to undergo the unspeakable humiliation of another 18 Brumaire. My prediction was thus fulfilled even sooner than I expected." August 10, when the revolutionary assembly began its Reign of Terror, and the 18 Brumaire (November 9th, 1799), when Napoleon overthrew the Directory, have here been represented by the long years in which both Senate and President were reduced to be right and left hands of an Emperor superior to them both—Slavery. That supreme power having reached its Waterloo and its grave, the Man and the Assembly stand face to face with each other. For the moment, the President's struggle is not with the Assembly representing the people, but that conflict may at any time occur. One can only find satisfaction in the prospect because of the "new departure" beyond. "I envy you Americans," said Carlyle once, "you and we are trains dashing on to the same precipice, and you'll get smashed first." The timid President, who, raised from the Vice-Presidency, or doubtfully elected, does not feel the pluck of his position; the patriotic President; the moderate man of the world, representing its business and wealth which are injured by political agitations; these may make the current appear peaceful for a time. But the sluggish stream undermines its own banks, and the wise engineer will build levees not for the low water, but for the flood. The Jacksonian or Johnsonian freshet is sure to be repeated. Or another congressional *coup d'état*, like that which took from President Johnson his constitutional control of the army, may evoke a presidential *coup d'état* under some chief combining Johnson's recklessness with Grant's ability and following. We hear of "checks" on this or that branch of the government; but why create a power requiring checks? Why create a giant to do a man s work and then bind him down artificially to a man's strength? Were it not more sensible to begin by creating the man so that the giant need not be feared, being impossible? The President is a giant to be kept, not always successfully, with one hand in a sling; Universal Suffrage is another. Should the masses fail to elect a President the task is thrown into the House of Representatives. But for this purpose the popular House is deprived of its representative character; all the delegates of New York have one vote and those of Rhode Island one. What if this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

extemporized oligarchy should, under cover of the ballot, choose the candidate who stands third in the suffrage of the people? Here were a premium on anarchy. Instead of with one hand giving the masses a power which must be taken from them with the other, were it not wiser to give them a legitimate strength which could require no check?

Under an executive headship, irremovable by the people or their representatives, universal suffrage is liable at any time to be placed in contradiction with itself. Should an executive elected to represent a certain principle of vital and urgent importance turn around, on reaching power, and represent the opposite principle, the nation is legally ruled by a man it never elected. If the individual is shrewd enough to confine himself to his constitutional weapons—and even the impeachment of Johnson did not declare his outrages unconstitutional—the people are thrown on the horns of a dilemma: they must submit to a despotism which may ruin the country, or they must revolutionize. As a matter of fact, our quadrennial election is a revolution. Under a personal supremacy unamenable to changes in the popular need it cannot be otherwise. It may be without bloodshed, but it is apt to be without the few advantages of armed revolution. It is likely to come after the mischief is done. The ancient Cretans legalized insurrection against magisterial usurpation; under Valerius Publicola a Roman law gave permission to any one to kill a magistrate for an attempt against the liberty of the Republic. The United States has gone so far as to place beside every President a Vice-President with strong inducement to put his superior out of the way, but, just now, the experience of the country is against both rebellion and regicide. Insurrection on our side, however, is condoned. The insurrection of Kansas Free-State men against the authority of Pierce, and that of secessionists against Lincoln, are distinguished from each other by private preference. It is conceivable that regicide might stand differently with us if instead of being illustrated by Wilkes Booth and Guiteau some enthusiast had killed President Buchanan when he was disposing the forces of the country—quite constitutionally—in the interest of a secession against which there was no law. If that administration could have been removed at once it is probable that slavery would have surrendered without war. In England the change would have been made in an hour by the representatives of the people.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The comparative dignity lent to our politics by a great moral issue having passed away with the extinction of slavery, the presidential contest reveals its meanness in the midst of an industrial civilization. Every four years the nation forms its ring, the candidates enter, and the pugilism begins. If one seems worsted, his backers throw mud. There is a grand exchange of calumnies and insults. When the successful pugilist enters the palace he is regarded by nearly half his subjects as the arch-scoundrel of the country. The Senate has not the slightest doubt that Mr. Cleveland will evade the law about appointments if he is not watched; a majority of States, that is, either regard their President as capable of perjury, or else suspect that their restraints on him would be proved unconstitutional if put to the test. For this war of bitter personalities, involving private character, fifty millions of people are thrown into convulsions every four years! For this the whole official service of the country is to be quadriennially revolutionized!

Inter arma silent—rationes. The parties on each side being drawn up in the order of battle, under their respective chiefs, victory becomes the one thing important. The armies are organized under political generals, colonels, drill-sergeants; deserters are warned that they will be politically shot; every question of sentiment, honesty, fairness, is met with the finality *le Boss le veut.* How comical appears the ancient provision by our fathers of an Electoral College, through which the passionate popular suffrage was to be filtered and interpreted before being represented in an Executive! In a recent instance, when the vote of one elector transferred from his party might have defeated the determination of that party to enthrone its candidate, though not elected, some looked to a certain eminent elector to show independence of party in the interest of justice. Vain hope! A humorous English gentleman traveling in Germany, received much attention by the simple process of registering himself in hotels as "Elector of Middlesex." The old dignity of the title might revive in America should a college of electors show any independence; but how can one desire it while our Presidential election is a battle, in which "bolting" is treated as desertion in the face of the enemy? It is to be feared that recognition of the independence of the Electoral College would simply mean the blackmailing of candidates. And if a President were chosen by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one or two electors transferred from his opponent's ticket, it is pretty certain that the disappointed majority would not submit. In fact, a republic with an emperor is like Hawthorne's man with a serpent in his bosom. Whatever he eats goes to feed that foreign life; his own tissues are steadily enfeebled. The Electoral College is in atrophy; the free town-meeting, influenced by the ablest citizens, is supplanted by the caucus controlled by the boss; the high-road to Presidency is servility to party. So the imperial parasite grows strong; the secret Cabinet at the White House corresponds to a star chamber in the Senate; occult relations are established where the Constitution has forbidden open ones. We are living under a different Constitution from that framed a hundred years ago, yet it is one structurally developed out of that by its all-absorbing imperialist feature, with its power of reducing to nullity all organs not congenial to itself. While Louis Napoleon reigned, all the unpurchasable thinkers of France lived in exile; but are not the thinkers of America also exiled from political life? The reasoning powers of the country are so little turned to political affairs that the most important crisis hardly elicits their counsel or criticism. Not long ago, for example, it became necessary to provide further for the succession to a deceased Vice-President. When the office of Vice-President was suggested it met with strong opposition in the Convention (1787) on grounds now amply justified by its history. Having elected a President, nothing can be more fatuous than to allow any man or party to reap any advantage from his death. Here was an occasion when the solecism could have been removed by providing that, on a President's death, his chosen constitutional advisers should act as an Executive Commission to continue the administration. If England is regularly governed in this way, why might not the United States be so administered for a time? The suggestion was not even made; and we have now set behind the President a train of possible presidents, each with an inducement to get rid of the president-elect, and then with the next above him in the ministerial succession! Where was the American brain when this ingenious absurdity was made into law? In exile. The legislative functions of the country are plainly in the hands of men whom imperialism has made over into its own image. To them a government without an individual man at its head were no government at all.

No superstition could be more unscientific, no scheme more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unrepublican. In a republic a Head detached from the shoulders of the People is no head at all. Even if it be a head they made themselves and set on their own shoulders, it is not their head unless it is in vital relation to their whole Body at every instant. The Head of a People must therefore be chosen by the permanent organization of their life, which, in a Republic, is represented in the assembly to which their political powers are delegated; and on this power which created it the Head must depend from day to day for its functional existence, because there is no reason whatever for its existence except for the sake of the whole Body. A Head with personal interests of its own is inconsistent with any form of self-government. A corollary of this is that the Head of a Republic cannot be an individual man. The political organism exists only to protect and develop the social organism. This consists of a complex variety of interests which may be practically classed and represented in corresponding departments of legislation and administration. The judicial, financial, industrial, military, foreign, postal, or other interests of the nation, assign tasks to the several masters in such departments. These functionaries represent the cerebral organs of the State. But what organ does a president represent? The Premier of England must have a portfolio; Gladstone at one time held two; a man is conceivable who should be master of all departments; but our President has no such function. How then can he be the head of the political organism? In nature there is no presidency in the head of any organism. Beyond the cerebral organs, with their definite functions, representative of every part of the body, there is no supernumerary head. If it be said that the presidential function is to oversee the organs and hold them to their work, that would imply that an individual man may be superior to each of the heads of departments in that minister's own line. No one, of course, would object to the presidency of omniscience, but by what expediency is a finite man set to superintend ministers of finance or war who is inferior to the ministers in such specialties? The only possible superintendence of those organs which collectively make the Head of civil society must be the general wisdom and knowledge of the country, between which and its executive organs reflex influences pass through representative nerves. The representative legislature is the thinking power of a sound social organism; the Executive is its Hand; the legislative thought directs the execu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive hand through re-representative organs, administrative controllers, who are severally the special knowledge of the nation in some department projected in specialized function. These specialized organs naturally unite in a Head, because they can only act by co-operation; the war functionary must consult the treasurer, and both the internal condition or the foreign relations of the nation. But in all this series no place has ever been pointed out by political science for a minister without a portfolio, a supreme organ without any function except to be supreme.

All this, true of civil government, is changed under military government. In war all functions become subservient to one, and individual chieftainship is in its right place. So long as the barbarous régime of war underlies civilization, every nation will naturally preserve the means of transforming itself into a military despotism. But even in that case the individual head cannot be a civilian. There is no case, therefore, in which a president can be useful, unless by some accident. Even President Lincoln, our happiest accident, by his ignorance of war, by ill-advised appointments, like that of Burnside, cost the country much blood and treasure. Presidency is unquestionably a "survival" of military chieftainship, and in civil government it is out of its place. The "survival" of ancient chieftainship in the occupant of the English throne serves an indirect defensive purpose. Were the throne there abolished it would still be claimed as the right of some family, and there is a powerful class, owning the soil, who could be utilized by German despotism to set up a King Stork in place of the present King Log. To some extent presidency in France is also excusable, because it occupies the place where imperialist and royalist conspirators long to set a throne. But in America there is no such excuse. The presidency is here a "survival" which has been and can be only mischievous if active; which preserves the passions and perils of military ages, making our progress convulsive, lowering politics which, in normal society, would be the highest vocation. Stripped of imperial powers, presidency in a Republic were at once revealed as no Head at all, but a cap of painted plumes borrowed from the savage. Presidency, at best, is but monarchy in masquerade. Even then it is mischievous; for it gives social pre-eminence to the occupant of an office normally secured by servility instead of by service. "If any will be great among you let him serve." In a true Republic there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could be no lustre not flowing from eminent services. It is a degradation when official position, obtained by partisanship, can raise above all the thinkers, scholars, philanthropists of a nation, an inferior person. It is an instruction of youth in the worship of success irrespective of merit; it is a cult of snobbery more vulgar than that which surrounds the rank attained by birth. The forces of heredity are real, the values of high-breeding are great, albeit unsuited for governmental requirements; but "aristocracy" has never descended lower than in subjecting the Republic of the New World to a Peerage of "Bosses," with power to enthrone an Arch-boss as the fountain of honor for a people consecrated by their history to human equality, and by their genius to respect only for superiorities of character and intelligence. We reverence to-day the men who declared our independence of Old World royalty; our posterity will honor still more those who shall secure independence from New World imperialism.

MONCURE D. CONWAY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A LETTER ON PRAYER FROM THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.

THOSE whom he teaches have a right to demand that the scientist shall be reverent. Further than this, it is but just to claim that he shall possess the religious spirit. Dealing with conclusions drawn from discoveries of laws extending throughout the whole range of material existence, he should not deny to the intellect which leans on his the least hint of the evidence of God and eternal life. It is with joy that the devout student of science finds this need fully recognized by the Duke of Argyll. The same thing may be said of our distinguished American, John Fiske, whose writings constantly suggest lines of thought parallel to those of Argyll. Superficial thinkers have ignorantly permitted themselves to call any scientist who admits that all things are a process governed by natural law, which is an observed order of facts, instead of a special creation governed by an arbitrary and supernatural will, "materialists," "infidels," and even "atheists." Such designations are absolutely undeserved by these two writers. Religion, pure and simple, the recognizing of a Source of Righteousness, and the worshiping attitude toward that Infinite, are the very root and base, as well as the pinnacle, of all their arguments. But wide as the range of their erudition may be, each approaches the Absolute from almost precisely opposite points. Each reaches an Alpha and Omega, but by paths by no means parallel, and often most radically diverging. Following the Darwinian theory of Evolution from its earliest conclusions of primeval history, ages before the earth became habitable by man, up to the laws of evolution in society, which are proven with the same painstaking care and illustration, Mr. Fiske presents the whole scheme of existence in a clear and ever-deepening and broadening stream of logic, until it flows with majestic current and irresistible force into the ocean of the invisible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the other hand, the Duke of Argyll, ever endeavoring to square his reasoning to the lines of Revelation, admits intuition, inspiration, and supernatural influence to be large factors in the development of human character; takes into consideration spiritual phenomena, and, permeated with the theologic spirit, suggests a science of the invisible, where his contemporary stops on its shores. Mr. Fiske claims to know nothing of that Beyond, in which science loses herself for lack of data. Argyll at least virtually admits his belief that such data can be obtained, and that the depths of the waters of the Unknown can eventually be sounded.

These relative positions, more or less constantly maintained by writers so diverse, yet seem to lead to one end in common, viz., the idea that conscious being must continue to remain conscious being even beyond the time when it shall cease to be connected with a physical organization; that moral and intellectual superiority will be advantageous hereafter as well as here; and that righteousness is the only harmonious relationship man can hold with the Author of his being.

Such teaching must inevitably popularize and make gracious and inviting those themes which hitherto have seemed to the general public too abstruse and too unpractical. Whatever leads away from Deity must eventually lose its interest. Chance is neither attractive nor useful. The mind demands sequence, and rejects that which does not appeal to reason. The inherent dignity of human nature denies the theory that a man is but an atom amidst a universe of atoms, without purpose, object, or excuse for being, and without hope, aspiration, or future. By entertaining writers whose exact deductions are still poetic, and whose justice both ways toward the psychical and the physical do not interrupt, but rather emphasize, the rhythmic harmony of their interaction, the reader who understands the grand theme at all must necessarily fall into the swing and flow of their intellectual current, and be borne easily and strongly on to a satisfactory result. Mr. Fiske, proving conclusively that religion is the acme of human superiority by his clear-cut analysis of every phase of conscious or unconscious existence; and the Duke, enlightening, with sun-like vividness, our conception of the true meaning of terms, words, and definitions, and of all the error and misjudgment occasioned by stupid or malicious misinterpretations, bring us, both

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by intuition and reason, to conceive that we are at last on the right road.

After reading the works of the Duke of Argyll, I was puzzled by the positions he took regarding "Grace" and prayer. I ventured to send him a letter. He kindly replied, and in a vein, as I am bound to suppose, which will bear publication. Since the queries which arose in my mind may have occurred to others, I do not hesitate to give the substance of my communication.

"In speaking of prayer," I wrote, "you say, 'The compromise now offered by some philosophers is this: that although the course of external nature is unalterable, yet possibly the phenomena of mind and character may be changed by the Divine agency.' But you instantly question this, and assert that 'the mind is as much under the dominion of law as the body.' How, then, are we to judge of the effects of 'Grace?' I believe the meaning of 'Grace' may be indicated as follows: If a soul supplicate its Creator to improve its condition, in reply to that supplication, if made 'in spirit and in truth,' there comes into that soul a new righteousness; a righteousness which it did not before possess, and which is outside or beyond any physical law acting in the brain. It may be regarded as an *influx* from the invisible, and is supposed to be bestowed in answer to the prayer.

"In other words, this advantage drops on the soul as rain drops on the body. It is not worked out in our own beings. If this is a clear idea of 'Grace,' I cannot comprehend how it can be compatible with law, which, acting on the brain, produces effects limited by its own conditions. Or does the very act of supplication change the law acting in the attributes of intellect, so as to *produce* righteousness? If so, one might as well pray to one's self. Yet experience proves that prayer for spiritual improvement does in marked cases produce, gain, or advance righteousness with surprising rapidity. You do not definitely state your opinion as to the results of prayer, save as it affects the conduct of men. Other superstitions affect men to their moral advantage. I cannot see that you definitely assert your belief that if we make a reasonable appeal to God, one which is in harmony with natural laws but which may be an *especial adjustment* of them in our favor, that it is in His power to alter the regular course of things for our benefit. If we happen to ask for something in natural sequence to previous events we shall probably receive it; but shall we receive it should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it vary by a hair from the Creator's original or present intention? Will anything different occur than would have occurred before we asked? Can, will, or does God adjust matter and spirit for the benefit of one who prays, when, had one not prayed, no adjustment would have taken place? Is there any scientific evidence of reciprocity between God and His creature, by which the unchangeable can be changed, as a child may persuade and alter the intention of his father? If so, is there a definable limit to this adjustment? Is it bounded by law? I ask because I recognize the great significance of the question of mutual relationship between my Heavenly Father and myself. If there is no reciprocity of feeling, sympathy, and understanding, where is the link which connects me with Him? I have noted favorable changes in conditions and in people after having prayed for such. Was this the granting of my wish by God as an outside and adjusting factor, or was it the product of a natural law—the sequence of a concentrated will? If I cannot expect from God any adjustment save that which He made in the beginning of creation, but am without consultation of my desire placed among forces visible and invisible, to which I must adjust myself and which I must manipulate or fail and perish, I feel myself no better than the pen wherewith I write, and my conscious being a delusion and a mockery."

To these questions and comments, the Duke of Argyll courteously replied with the following letter:

LONDON, *November*, 22.

MADAM: I have received your letter of the 8th, in which you ask *some* questions which are beyond the reach of human intellect. But one question you put, respecting my own meaning in certain passages of "The Reign of Law," which you seem to think are incompatible with the belief in the efficacy of prayer in any case. My reply is direct, that you have misunderstood me. The proposition that the mind is subject to "law" does not mean that it is subject to *material* and *physical* law. It only means that the spiritual world has laws of its own, quite as definite and quite as supreme as the laws of the physical world. But this does not in the least affect our belief in prayer, because *one* of the laws of the spiritual world may be (and as Christians believe, must be) that the human soul is in relations and in correspondence with the Divine Spirit, so as *to be acted on thereby.* The bare intellectual difficulty of understanding *how* events can ever be changed by supplication, consistently with our notions of the Divine fore-knowledge and decrees, is, and must ever remain, an insoluble difficulty to us. But it has always appeared to me that this difficulty equally applies to the case of changes brought about by appeals to the will and voluntary action of our fellow men. We know as a matter of fact that these appeals *do* change purpose, and through purpose do change events. Yet theoretically we don't quite see how this familiar experience

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is to be reconciled with the proposition that all events are fore-ordained by the Almighty Will. Probably the solution lies in the profound ignorance in which we live as to the real conditions about which we talk when we frame propositions about "Foreknowledge" and "Decrees." We are probably in a great measure *thinking nonsense* when we frame words and sentences to express the relations between the Divine Mind, or the Supreme Will, and the events which (to us) take place in time. We may well be content to "know," that "by marked cases as examples, this supplication for spiritual improvement will gain or produce or advance the graces of human character with surprising rapidity." We also know by a perfect consciousness that this effect is not produced by "*praying to ourselves*," and could not be produced if we thought we had no one else to pray to. I must beg you to excuse a very hasty letter, dealing, of course, very inadequately with one of the most difficult and profound of all subjects. I am much gratified by the kind expressions you employ in reference to the value of my books to those who are troubled on such questions. My book called "The Unity of Nature," is a further development of the same subject (as "The Reign of Law"), and approaches more nearly the main end: "Law in Theology."

Your Obedient Servant,
ARGYLL.

MRS. CORA LINN DANIELS,
FRANKLIN, Mass.

Mr. Fiske's method of stating that the mind is not subject to physical law is expressed thus:

"Modern discovery, so far from bridging over the chasm between Mind and Matter, tends rather to exhibit the distinction between them as absolute."

Starting with the questions, "What is matter? What is mind?" one can hardly bring together two instructors who can give better, more concise, more erudite, more diverse, or more satisfactory answers. The climax of Argyll's thinking, so far as is published in "The Unity of Nature," is reached thus:

"We come to understand that the processes of development or of creation, whatever they may have been, which culminated in such a being as Man, are processes wholly governed and directed by a Law of adjustment between the higher truths it concerns him to know and the evolution of faculties by which alone he could be enabled to apprehend them. There is no difficulty in conceiving these processes carried to *the most perfect consummation*."

With equal reverence, and after his usual profound course of reasoning, the American serenely ends "The Idea of God" thus:

"The events of the universe are not the work of chance, neither are they the outcome of blind necessity. Practically, there is a purpose in the world, whereof it is our highest duty to learn the lesson. When from the dawn of life we see all things working together toward the evolution of the highest spiritual attributes of Man, we know, however the words may stumble in which we try to say it, that God is in the deepest sense a moral Being. The everlasting source of phenomena is none other than the Infinite Power which makes for righteousness."

CORA LINN DANIELS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MODERN FEUDALISM.

It is an old truth that commerce, founded on the basis of distributing the staples of life at the least cost, is the highest practical benevolence; while devices to rule commerce by the suspension of competition, and to exact arbitrary profits from the masses, are the extreme of selfishness and oppression. The universal nature of this truth was perceived when the world emerged from the mediæval system of economics, but it seems in danger of being forgotten. This is illustrated by the criticism of Mr. E. P. Alexander, the most recent writer on the railway question, that those who hold competition to be the only just measure of profits in any industry are "years behind the age in comprehension of the science of the railway question." But the very question at issue is whether they are not more in accord with the essential principles of nineteenth century democracy than those who are turning commerce back to the era of prices fixed by combinations and the suspension of competition.

Besides the anthracite coal pool, which, from the public attention recently attracted to it, and its direct action upon the interests of the masses, furnishes a particularly striking example of the combination policy, other signal instances can be found of monopolizing great industries, and enhancing the cost of the necessaries of life. The history of the Standard Oil monopoly has been told in such a variety of forms that it is only necessary to estimate the magnitude of its effect upon the consumers of petroleum. The claim that its rule has cheapened the cost of petroleum is reported to have nonplussed even so independent a thinker as Mr. Henry George, when presented to him at Cleveland last summer. But those familiar with the operations of that remarkable monopoly know that it can sell petroleum cheaper than other refiners, only because of the advantages given to it in transportation by the railways; that it does sell cheaper only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at points where it desires to crush out sporadic attempts at competition; and that on the vast aggregate of its traffic it enjoys the full benefit of the impregnable barrier which it has erected between the thousands of producers of crude petroleum on the one hand and the millions of consumers of refined on the other. It is true that there has been a decline of 50 to 60 per cent. in the retail price of refined petroleum since the ante-Standard period; but those who regard that as a mitigation of the monopoly forget that there has been a decline of 70 to 80 per cent. in the price of crude. The marked difference between the decline which might have taken place with free competition and that which has actually occurred is shown in the United States census report on the "Necessaries of Life." Among thirty-five places from which the retail price of petroleum is reported, at the few points which could be reached by what little competition existed at the time of the report, the retail price of petroleum was 12½ to 15 cents per gallon, and at all other points the price ranged from 20 to 25 cents. Of late years, the price fixed by the Standard Oil Company in Texas was 35 cents when it was undisturbed in that territory. When a competing company succeeded in shipping petroleum to Texas the price was reduced to 21 cents. Place the extra cost established by monopoly at 5 cents in adjacent territory, with a variation to 14 cents at remote points, and the tax thus imposed on the 380,000,000 gallons of domestic consumption can be appreciated.

A startling measure of the value of this monopoly to those who share in it, is the statement that its wealth, represented at its inception by a capital of $1,000,000, is now placed by the quotations of shares in the various corporations and trusts which are comprised within its vast entity, at the enormous sum of $400,000,000. This does not represent the profits realized from the favor of the railways; for the actual gains, while counted by tens of millions, do not exceed one quarter of that vast sum. Nor does it stand for the real investment in property, which might, perhaps, be replaced for one-tenth the amount. It simply represents the earning power of the monopoly itself. In other words, after deducting a generous estimate for the value of its actual property, the monopoly which this combination has been permitted to usurp, is estimated by its own members to yield dividends upon the enormous total of $350,000,000. Compare that estimate with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the increase of the retail price caused by the monopoly, which controls the trade from the mouth of the wells to the sale of oil from tank wagons at the doors of grocers, and it will be found that the statement of a tax of 10 cents per gallon for the benefit of the capital enjoying that monopoly errs, if at all, on the side of moderation.

An interesting relation can be traced between the success of the Standard and the rise of a highly similar combination to control the coke industry of Southwestern Pennsylvania. In 1876, forty-one firms were engaged in manufacturing coke from the Connellsville vein of coal, and the aggregate of the plant employed was 3,300 ovens. The value of that coal for coking purposes caused a rapid expansion of the industry in the years 1879–80–81. But concurrently with that expansion the evidence afforded by the Standard Oil Company, of the ability to monopolize an entire industry, was too tempting for an opportunity of copying it to escape notice. While the industry has grown from 3,300 ovens in 1876 to a total of 10,796 ovens at the close of last year, the process of combination has been urged with such vigor that 8,300 ovens are under the control of a single syndicate, 1,646 are owned by manufacturers who consume their own product, while the competitive factor is reduced to three small firms who still manage to find a market for the product of 850 ovens, or about one-tenth the capacity controlled by the syndicate. The composition of this organization is somewhat unique in its details. It is made up of three great firms, whose union rules the industry. About one-third of the capacity under syndicate control is owned by various smaller firms, who run their works as directed by the syndicate, and turn over their entire product to it at a very liberal commission, reported to be 25c. per ton, or one-fifth the average price for the past two years. With this advantage over the ordinary producer, the syndicate enjoys an impregnable prosperity, both in fat years and in lean. It directs the proportion of the trade which shall run or stand idle; decides the rate of wages for the entire industry, as well as for its own labor, and fixes the price of the product by such surprising feats as its recent advance of 50 cents per ton, or one-third of the former price—much to the discomfort of iron-founders, who thus find the cost of their raw material suddenly increased to the extent of an extra dollar per ton on their own products.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has been rather stunning to the agricultural interests of the South to discover, during the past fifteen months, that the cotton-seed crushing mills had passed under the control of a single combination. The presence of some leading Standard Oil capitalists, and the faithful adoption of its favorite method of consolidation by means of a "Trust," leaves little doubt as to the paternity of the scheme, which now manages 98 per cent. of the capacity of the cotton-seed oil mills, fixes the price of the oil in the markets of the country, and ordains exactly the price which the planters shall get for their seed at the mills. The effect of this monopoly has not yet been felt by the consumers of alleged olive oil, oleomargarine, and oil cake; but the producers have experienced a very tangible result of the removal of competition in the purchase of seed by a reduction from the price before realized, averaging $5 per ton. On the total amount of seed crushed last year this reduction amounts to $3,000,000; which gain may perhaps explain the fact that the price of certificates in the "Trust," capitalized at two or three times the actual cost of the mills, is at a large premium. Naturally there is a great outcry among the planters of the South at this sudden transfer from their pockets to those of an irresponsible combination of the sum of $3,000,000 a year, with capabilities of indefinite expansion.

Beyond the instances already noted of the effects of combination on the price of fuel, there is a very striking example of what the combined control of railway transportation can do with regard to food. It has been one of the social phenomena of the times that, after an era of general reduction in prices, and with an almost infinite expansion of the field of production, the one great staple that has nearly maintained the old level of values, is beef. Some light is thrown on this exceptional firmness by allegations that improved stock-cars, which bring the cattle to market in so much better condition as to equal a gain of $3 per head, are burdened with heavy charges, because their use would ruin the business of the stock-yards, where double prices for shelter and forage yield a rich revenue on the railway capital invested. This is an *ex parte* statement, but it finds strong corroboration in other quarters. For another form of transportation which effects economy by shipping only the dressed beef and saving the cost of carrying the hide and offal, is neutralized by the authority of the trunk line pool, with the principle that the consumer must be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made to pay as much freight on a pound of dressed as he would have had to pay had it been shipped on the hoof. The discrimination in this case is about the same as against improved live-stock cars, being 30 cents per hundred pounds between Chicago and New York. Heretofore the assertion has been made only by the critics of the railways, that improvements and economies in the transportation of meats were obstructed for the purpose of making the traffic pay tribute to the investments in stock yards; but now we have the admission of that unquestioned railroad authority, Mr. E. P. Alexander, that the objection lies in the fact that the "investments in stock-yards and abbatoirs are threatened with destruction;" and this gentleman turns an extraordinary light on the railway view of the question, by the declaration that "there is no abstract principle of right or wrong, or honesty or dishonesty, to which such questions can be referred." This is a remarkable assertion to come from one of the most enlightened railway men of the day. If there is no principle of right or wrong involved in the question whether devices to cheapen the cost of transporting meat or improve its quality shall be allowed full play; if there is no honesty or dishonesty in the question whether the combined control of the highways of commerce can forbid such improvements in order to maintain the profits of stock-yard syndicates and live-stock "eveners" rings, then let us be thankful that the nation is "years behind the age in comprehension of the science of the railway question." A half cent per pound, which is about the extra burden thus placed on the beef that comes from the West to the seaboard, does not seem a very great imposition. But a half cent added to the primary wholesale cost grows to a cent per pound in the retail price. On the receipts of live stock and dressed beef at New York and New England points last year, that increase amounts to $11,000,000. As the cost of Western beef fixes the retail price of all the beef sold in the Eastern market, the aggregate of this additional tax on food for the benefit of favored capital may be estimated at a gigantic total.

The results effected by the obstruction of competition in the five great staples, anthracite coal, coke, petroleum, beef, and cotton-seed oil, are of such magnitude that, in comparison with the effect of that historical three-cent tax on tea, they might be expected to produce a social cataclysm. When the units of a dollar a ton on anthracite, ten cents per gallon on petroleum, twenty-five cents

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per ton on coke, one cent per pound on beef, and $5 per ton on cotton-seed, are multiplied into the aggregates of consumption, it can be seen that the burdens imposed on the masses for the benefit of the interested capital are counted by the tens of millions annually; and it no longer appears strange that the valuation of these monopolies is expressed by the hundreds of millions. If such results can be effected in the first and experimental decade of the combination, what may not be done in a quarter of a century? If the monopoly of five industries of varying magnitude has created fortunes, held to aggregate somewhere between five hundred and a thousand millions, what vast prizes may not be gained by those who perfect and extend the policy to all branches of manufacture, and to the supply of every article of food? And when every industrial process is under the combination rule, the obnoxious influence of competition wholly abolished, and the people at large left no option but to pay just such prices, and accept just such wages as the combinations may dictate, what an ideal state of society will be established—for the favored capitalists!

What is the cause of all this? At the foundation, of course, the trouble is the same as with Bunyan's "Man with the Muck-rake." Men are so busy at the universal work of raking together wealth, that they have no time to look up to the higher qualities of justice and public welfare in the operation of our commercial system. But since the desire for wealth, as a motive of life, is beyond the reach of laws or public agitation, the question must be directed to the defects or abuses which allow the general acquisitiveness to be so successfully exerted in the case of the few, so much to the detriment of the many.

Mr. Henry George, in his recent review of the industrial condition of Pennsylvania, seems inclined to divide the responsibility between land monopoly and the protective tariff; and many newspaper writers, who utterly reject his views on the former topic, agree with him, to the extent, at least, of charging the anthracite coal combination to protection. Pennsylvania, beyond dispute, affords a fruitful field for the study of industrial monopoly. It has the anthracite coal combination in the northeast; the petroleum monopoly in the northwest; the coke syndicate in the southwest; several bituminous and gas coal pools fill in the intervals; and if there is no corresponding combination in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

southeastern portion of the State, the omission must be excused on the ground that there is nothing there worth monopolizing. The position of Pennsylvania, as the State of the greatest protected industries, leads many to the conclusion that these phenomena are the offspring of protection. But whatever long-standing differences may exist as to the policy of stimulating home industries by a tariff to raise the price of imported products, that is entirely separate from the question whether those, or other domestic industries, shall be open to the free competition of all who wish to engage in them. The sole object of the protective tariff is to increase and encourage domestic competition in the protected industries; the sole object of the combination policy is to prevent that competition in the industries which it controls. This appears even more plainly in the facts. If protection were the cause of monopoly, the monopolies should be the strongest in the most directly protected industries. Yet in the bituminous coal trade, which is directly protected, combination has only succeeded in controlling remote districts and limited markets; while in the anthracite interest, which is only protected indirectly through the tariff on bituminous, the rule of combination has been practically continuous for fifteen years. Iron, steel, glass, and wool are directly protected industries; and, except for the partially successful combination in the Bessemer steel industry, those interests are completely ruled by the free action of demand and supply. On the other hand, petroleum is not protected at all, and presents the most complete example of unmitigated monopoly. It is not designed to discuss Mr. George's land theory; but it is surely a salient fact that in but one of these combinations does the ownership of land bear any part, while the abolition of property in land would not loosen the grasp of any of them on the means of preventing competition. It may also be pertinent to note in this connection that this very State, where the combinations are most rife, approaches most nearly to the application of Mr. George's remedy, by levying, as the last message of its Governor shows, practically all of its taxation on real estate.

What, then, is the source of the power over competition which gives these combinations existence and security? The answer to that question is found in the ability to exclude competition by control of the routes of transportation. The railway pool,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

although its career as the conqueror of competition in transportation has been chequered with failure, is the parent of this promising brood of combinations, each of which has attained absolutism in its especial sphere. The old fiction that the Standard's monopoly was the growth of competition among the railroads having been lately reviewed, it is necessary to repeat the fact that the first scheme to monopolize the petroleum traffic, when the Standard Oil Company had but a local importance, possessed the pooling features of apportionment of traffic between the railways by arbitrary percentages, which were to be guaranteed by the corporation—the South Improvement Company—in whose hands the railways placed the monopoly of the business, by rebates on the part of the railways, that were avowedly "a guarantee against competition." The railways were to guarantee the monopoly of the petroleum traffic for the sake of escaping from competition among themselves; and this scheme being ruined by premature exposure, the Standard Oil Company fell heir to the monopolistic estate. Whenever, during the contest that resulted in the triumph of monopoly, there was any approach to competition among the railroads, the independent refiners received a new lease of life; when the league and covenant against free competition was established between the railways and the Standard in 1877, as a part of the first trunk line pool, the doom of the independent industry was sealed. Within the last twelve months renewed examples have been given, how competition in transportation gives birth to new attempts at competition in the refining industry, and how the re-establishment of the pooling policy among the railroads renews the sway of the Standard. The same foundation is found in every other case where an entire industry has been monopolized. The coke syndicate holds its control of eight-tenths the production by discriminations which are privately reported on long hauls to exceed the entire cost of production at the ovens. Coal pools wherever they exist are held in place by railway pools behind them. The obstruction of new methods in the marketing of beef is a direct application of the power of railway preference; and when railway competition has burst the bonds of pooling combinations, the freight rates on dressed beef have approached an equality with those on live stock. The Southern people do not seem to have a clear idea of how the cotton-seed oil monopoly was established, beyond the pathetic opinion of one planter, who writes to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the papers that "the railroads are somehow mixed up in it;" but the fact that the average freight on a ton of cotton-seed is half its value at the mills, together with the presence, at the head of the combination, of the petroleum monopolists, who order the Southern railways to "give the screw another turn" when an independent shipper of petroleum finds his way to their territory, makes it as plain as a guide-board to those who know the history of the Standard, that its new conquest is built upon the same foundation of railway discriminations.

The striking article by Mr. Lloyd, in a former number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, on the almost universal tendency toward combination, showed the effort to extend far beyond the instances I have given. But his numerous examples illustrate the presence of this law as a check upon such combinations,—that unless there is some external influence to forbid new competition, such combinations only serve to attract fresh capital into the business. In the case of the match combination, the barbed wire pool, the Bessemer Steel Association, and a score of minor combinations, the monopoly is simply that granted for a limited time by our patent laws. Beyond that, no combination has ever succeeded in excluding competition from the production of any staple, unless the favor of the railways was secured to forbid new competitors the benefit of as cheap transportation as the pools can command. Iron, nails, glass, and iron pipe associations fix the list prices of their wares; but the prices of the two former products fluctuate freely,—sometimes as much as forty per cent. below the card,—while the market prices of glass and iron pipes are shown by discounts of 60, 70, and 80 per cent. from the lists. The whisky pool cannot maintain the price of alcohol above the cost of manufacture with the government tax added; and the wall paper pool, although a remarkable example of private combination, has neutralized itself by calling into active operation a considerable list of anti-pool manufacturers. The production of any staple has never been monopolized, except by advantages in the rates of transportation; and the fact also appears in the history of all these combinations, that not only railway discriminations, but railway pooling is essential to their success. A single railway may impose discriminations on its local traffic; but to maintain the discriminations which control an entire industry, the union of all the railways performing transportation for that industry is a fun-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

damental necessity. This enables us to estimate briefly the actual effect of the most gigantic effort of combination—the railway pool. The attempt of this form of combination to impose arbitrary freight rates on commerce has so far met with very limited success. Upon the traffic of the country at large its efforts to advance railway charges have not been more than temporarily successful. But the vital fact appears in the history of railway pooling that those combinations which maintained such monopolies as the Standard Oil Company, the anthracite combination, the Chicago live stock "eveners," and the coke syndicate have been the most enduring; while trunk line pools and Western freight associations have accomplished little more than a succession of fierce rate-wars, and the still more ruinous result of the creation of parallel lines. But suppose that the purpose of the great railway pools could also be accomplished, and competition so suspended that dividends on the $3,700,000,000 of fictitious capitalization, asserted by Mr. H. V. Poor to be injected into the railway system, could be imposed on the commerce of the country, what a stupendous tax would thus be levied on labor for the benefit of wholly fiat capital.

It is the almost universal plea in mitigation for this infraction of economic law, that the capital engaged in combination cannot earn fair profits if competition is allowed free play. But what constitutes the just measure of reward for capital? What are the fair profits for capital seeking investment in bonds, mortgages, or loans on commercial paper? The rate of interest that is fixed by free competition. What is the just measure of returns on capital invested in houses, stores, farms, small manufactures, or a thousand other forms of ordinary enterprise? Free competition. What indeed is the force which fixes the rate of wages, despite efforts of Labor organizations to oppose combination to the action of that force, and notwithstanding the violence provoked where these organizations are brought into conflict with the great combinations of capital? The competition of labor for wages. But the result of combination is to establish, for a favored class of capital, by means of the control of the highways of commerce, an exemption from the force which fixes the just reward of all other human effort, so that excessive profits can be exacted from the masses, to be counted by the tens of millions annually; and if the ideal of railway pooling could be attained, this policy would im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pose upon the nation a burden of fictitious capital three times the amount of the national debt!

The failure of the Labor leaders to perceive that this is the real foundation for the troubles of the working classes, can only be accounted for by their habit of regarding the workingman solely as a wage-earner, and ignoring his interest as a consumer. Mr. Powderly has inveighed against "the national sin of cheapness" and given his assent to the principle of combination to raise prices, on the assumption that such combinations involve an advance in wages. Let us suppose, for the sake of the argument, that the abolition of competition will return a certain proportion of the enhanced profits to the workingman in the shape of increased wages. If the anthracite coal pool raises the price of coal 50 cents per ton, and gives the miners 10 cents of the advance, a gain of $3,000,000 is secured in the annual wages of the miners; but a burden of $15,000,000 is imposed on the labor that consumes the coal. If the coke syndicate raises its price 50 cents per ton, and gives its workingman 10 cents advance, the advantage to labor at the coke ovens is $400,000 in a year; but a loss of many times the amount is inflicted on labor in the various forms in which that product finally reaches the consumer. If the same operation were repeated by combinations controlling every industry and every staple of consumption, what would be the result? An addition would be made to the cost of life, of which one-fifth would be given back to labor in the form of increased wages, and four-fifths would be drawn from labor to swell the profits of capital. Change the proportion to whatever form you like; the fact remains that all these combinations are organized to increase the profits of the capital engaged in them; and the increase must either be drawn from the pockets of consumers or extracted from the wages of laborers.

For it is by no means the rule that these combinations increase the wages of their employés. The anthracite coal trade is a shining example of the opposite result; and no better example of the different results of combination and competition on wages is needed than the bituminous coal industry. That interest is scattered over too vast a territory and enjoys too many routes of transportation to be brought under the control of a single combination. But certain districts are ruled by pools, and the significant fact appears, that in proportion as each district is open to competition,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the miner receives a larger share of the returns from the sale of the coal. From a comparison of statistics, based on official returns for 1883, it appears that in Allegheny County, where combination among the operators has always proved impracticable, the average rate of wages for all labor in the production of coal was $2.34 for each day's work. In Fayette and Westmoreland counties, where the industry was largely under the sway of the coke combination and the gas coal pools, the daily rate of wages was $1.79 and $1.75 respectively. In Clearfield County the control was secured by a monopoly of transportation, and the wages of the miners averaged $1.50 per day. The anthracite coal field in the same year yielded miners an average of $1.74 for each day's work. These figures are based on the number of days actually worked. When the average earnings of the whole year are taken into consideration, we find that while causes beyond the control of the operators in the Pittsburgh district afforded only 188 working days, the average pay of the miners for the year was $439, or more than in any other mining district of the State; while in the coke and anthracite districts, where the alleged policy of raising wages by arbitrary stoppages of work was in greater or less vogue, the total earned by miners in the year was from $20 to $50 less for from forty to sixty more days work. Another illustration shows the working of the same principle. The anthracite coal combination put up the price of coal fifty cents per ton last fall, and nothing has yet been heard of an advance in wages. The coke pool has advanced the price of coke sixty-five cents since there was an advance in wages, and the dispute is now pending whether their men shall get any of the benefit of the last advance. On the other hand, a conference between the operators and miners of the bituminous districts has just been concluded, with the result of advancing wages five cents per ton after May 1st; and the asking price on coal contracts, deliverable after that date, has advanced just five cents. Under combinations the laborers are lucky if they can get a fraction of the advance in prices; under competition the employers are satisfied if they get back the increase in wages by just the same enhancement in price. Take, as another illustration of the same principle, the freight-handlers' strike at Galveston last year. As long as the transcontinental pool lasted the Huntington lines were protected by the pool percentages against loss from the strike. When the pool was ruptured, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first thing done was to settle with the strikers, and get the freight moving again. These examples simply demonstrate the universal principle that competition between employers for the work of the laborer acts just as important a part in the just regulation of wages as competition for the sale of staples does in the prevention of arbitrary prices. There is no better protection for the laboring masses than the free competition of employers, transporters, and middlemen.

The artificial burdens imposed by combinations on the interchange and distribution of products constitute one of the chief causes of labor difficulties. When we hear of over-production, which simply means that because too much of everything is produced the masses are unable to get enough, it should not be difficult to recognize that the paradox of general want in the midst of universal abundance is only possible through the imposition of arbitrary burdens on the transportation and distribution of great staples. That any such burdens should exist is a wrong; that they should be used to increase the wealth of the few at the expense of laboring millions, is a still greater injustice; but that they should be made effective solely by the control of the highways of commerce founded for the public benefit by the most supreme act of sovereignty, is a monstrous perversion of economic law and governmental power. The conquest of all departments of industry by the power of combination has but just begun. But the mere beginning has imposed unwarrantable taxes on the fuel, light, and food of the masses. It has built up vast fortunes for the combining classes, drawn from the slender means of millions. It has added an immense stimulant to the process, already too active, of making the rich richer, and the poor poorer. The tendency in this direction is shown by the arguments with which the press has teemed for the past two months, that the process of combination is a necessary feature of industrial growth, and that the competition which fixes the profits of every ordinary trader, investor, or mechanic, must be abolished for the benefit of great corporations, while kept in full force against the masses of producers and consumers, between whom the barriers of these combinations are interposed.

This is the old question of privilege for a favored class, to the disadvantage of the people, presented in a new form. Its backward tendency is shown in the revival of commercial monopolies

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

like those of the Middle Ages; but our Modern Feudalism is most apparent in the erection of great and irresponsible rulers of industry, whose power, like that of the feudal barons, burdens the people, and even overshadows the government which gave it existence. The only important distinction is, that in the old days of force, the power of feudalism was measured by thousands of warriors; in the days of modern plutocracy, its power is measured by millions of money.

The law recently passed by Congress, for the regulation of railway traffic between the States, attempts to prohibit the abuses of discrimination and pooling by which these combinations are maintained. Whether a legislative prohibition can effect what the common law has failed to do; or whether these combinations have become so mighty as to be able to nullify national legislation, as well as the natural laws of trade, can only be decided by the experience of the future. But if the enormous character of the monopolies already created, and the still more threatening possibilities indicated by their example, are thoroughly understood, the public mind cannot fail to recognize the vital importance of a legislative declaration against the policy of combination on the thoroughfares of commerce, or to be aroused to the necessity of enforcing the principle that no monopolies are consistent with the spirit of popular institutions.

JAMES F. HUDSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME WAR LETTERS.

I.

THE following letter from Secretary Chase is the one referred to by me in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW of November last:

"WASHINGTON, *October* 13, 1861.

"MY DEAR GENERAL: Your telegram asking an 'assurance that ample supply of money and aid be given,' etc., was received a few moments ago, and my answer, that 'to the extent of means in the Treasury all requisitions for your command will be promptly answered,' is already on its way to you.

"I wish I could have said absolutely that all requisitions for your troops will be immediately responded to. It will not be my fault if they are not. I know the great importance of the work confided to you, and want to render you every aid in my power. To a considerable extent I shall feel warranted in paying preference to requisitions from you.

"But there is a limit to possibilities. The country has responded nobly to my call for means; but after all experience shows that about a million a day is all that we can hope to realize from home resources, and it is vain to look abroad until some decisive success shall have satisfied European capitalists, small as well as great, that the cause of the Union will triumph, and that at no very distant day.

"For the last six weeks requisitions have largely exceeded even the great sum of *a million a day*—so largely that the unpaid requisitions for which no present funds are or can be provided exceed twenty millions.

"While these circumstances impose on me the disagreeable necessity of discrimination, they imperiously require of all commanding generals to observe closely the expenditures in their several departments; to scan the profits of contractors; to insist on durable articles for clothing and transportation, as well as suitable and healthful food, and to guard as far as practicable against waste as well as imposition. Quartermasters and commissaries, as well as contractors, will bear watching.

"It is my belief that had due economy and vigilance been exercised from the first, there would have been now no excess of requisitions beyond means, while the army would have been vastly better armed, clothed, and equipped than now.

"Pardon these suggestions and observations. They are, perhaps, idle so far as you are concerned. But, as even 'Homer sometimes nodded,' you, who have so much ability and so much honorable zeal for the purity, as well as efficiency, of the service, may sometimes relax your vigilance, or be tempted to extravagance. If, from what I have said, an effective caution against both is derived, you will not regret it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Believe me, with most earnest desires for your success, and for your distinction. Your friend, S. P. CHASE."

"P. S.—May I add, do not over-estimate your enemy's force so much as to delay greatly your aggressive movements. In my judgment, we have lost much in this way."

II.

Admiral Porter's pointed and graphic description of the capture of Fort Fisher, and the cutting up of his 1,500 sailors, is an illustration of what sailors and marines could do when put to it on land. When the war broke out, our naval tubs could hardly float. Before its close there were armored ships and naval heroes in every harbor of the Southern coast, and when fighting opportunities failed on the water, the sailors were ready to lend a hand on shore.

"NORTH ATLANTIC SQUADRON,
"Flagship 'Malvern,'
"Off FORT FISHER, *January* 17, 1865.

"DEAR GENERAL: I send you some information from General Palmer. I have sent to Newbern letters sent by the Secretary of War to obtain more information, and will send it down to you as fast as it comes. We have taken Fort Fisher and all the outworks. The assault lasted seven hours. I had 1,500 sailors in the assault; they got badly cut up. The enemy had 2,300 men in the works. We assaulted with 5,000, including sailors and marines. The sailors made the first assault on the sea front; the rebels mistook them for regulars, opposed them with their whole force; of course there was great slaughter; the rebels gave three cheers thinking they had whipped our army off, at which moment they received a volley in their backs from our soldiers who were coming over the parapet on the other side. The rebels then brought all the force to bear on them, but our troops had gained a pretty secure footing on the parapet between the traverses, which are tremendous bomb proofs; then the hardest fight took place for seven hours that you ever saw. The old frigate 'Ironsides,' laying close to, would clean out with her guns between the traverses. It began to get dark when we got in re-enforcements and spades. The men went to digging. The enemy tried to get re-enforcements in, and landed them on Federal point, but the fire of the ships was so heavy in that direction that they could not advance. Thus our troops fought from traverse to traverse all through the works, for about one mile, when the rebels all run for the point of land, and, not being able to escape, gave themselves up, amounting to 1,800 or 1,900 men and officers. Gen. Whiting, Col. Lamb, and Gen. Colgate were among the prisoners, and some navy men.

"Last night they blew up Fort Caswell, and all the outworks and batteries on Smith's Island are destroyed. Our gunboats are now in Cape Fear River, and Wilmington is hermetically sealed against blockade runners. I shall make them believe we are going to attack that place, and make them draw all the forces there they can. We haven't force enough here to do any more than that, and now this leaves me plenty of gunboats to communicate with you along the coast. I have made arrangements at Beaufort, N. C., to supply you with ammunition, and can give you plenty of 12 or 24 pdr. howitzer ammunition, or guns if you want them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"If you will let me know by bearer, or any vessel coming up, what points you will touch at or about, I will be looking out for you. The best plan will be to send provisions in light-draft steamers, 10 feet, and let them rendezvous here in Cape Fear River, where I have a fine harbor.

"Now, good-bye, my dear General. I hope we will soon shake hands in Wilmington. The door through which the enemy was fed is closed on them, and all we have got to do is to watch them starve.

"Yours very truly and sincerely,

"DAVID D. PORTER, *Rear Admiral.*

"MAJ.-GEN. W. T. SHERMAN, Com'dg, etc., Savannah."

III.

Here is a note from Grant just before the battle of Chattanooga. Telegrams from Washington had come urging haste, or Burnside at Knoxville would be lost. Two of Sherman's divisions, spite of hard marching and superhuman effort, were not quite up. The reply from Sherman is characteristic of the man. The move took place at midnight, almost at the minute set in the reply.

"HEADQUARTERS MIL. DIV. OF THE MISSISSIPPI,

"CHATTANOOGA, Tenn., *November* 22, 1863.

"MAJ.-GEN. W. T. SHERMAN, Commanding Army of the Tenn.:

"GENERAL: Owing to the late hour when Ewing will get up, if he gets up at all to-night, and the entire impossibility of Woods reaching in time to participate to-morrow, I have directed Thomas that we will delay yet another day.

"Let me know to-morrow, at as early an hour as you can, if you will be entirely ready for Tuesday morning. I would prefer Woods should be up to cross with the balance of your command, but if he can be up in time to cross as soon as your pontoons are laid, I would prefer you should commence without him to delaying another day.

"Very respectfully,

"U. S. GRANT, *Maj.-Gen.*"

The Reply.

"HEADQUARTERS ARMY OF THE TENNESSEE,

"CAMP OPPOSITE CHICKAMAUGA, *November* 23, 1863.

"MAJ.-GEN. U. S. GRANT, Chattanooga:

"DEAR GENERAL: I received your letter at the hands of Capt. Audenried, and immediately made the orders for the delay of 24 hours. I need not express how I felt, that my troops should cause delay, but I know Woods must have some cause else he would not delay. Whitaker's and Crafts's troops fill the road, doubtless, and it must be a ditch full of big rocks. But Ewing is up, and, if possible, Woods or Osterhaus (for I got an orderly in the night announcing that he had overtaken, and would resume command to-day) will be also. But in any event we will move at midnight, and I will try the Missionary Ridge to-morrow morning November 24th, in the manner prescribed in my memorandum order for to-day.

"I will use the 2d division, in place of the 1st, as guide, and Jeff. C. Davis's division will act as reserve, and bring me forward the artillery as soon as the bridge is put down. I will try and get out at least six guns in the first dash for the hills.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"If you ask for positive information, I answer, no cause on earth shall induce me to ask for longer delay, and to-night at midnight we move.

"What delays may occur in the pontoons I cannot foretell. I will get Jeff. C. Davis to make some appearances opposite Harrison, to make believe our troops are moving past Bragg to interpose between him and Longstreet.

"Every military reason now sanctions a general attack. Longstreet is absent, and we expect no more re-enforcements, therefore we should not delay *another hour*, and should put all our strength in the attack. Yours truly,

"W. T. SHERMAN, *Major-Gen.*"

IV.

Here is a letter bearing on the attack at Chickasaw, but Mr. Blair, unlike General Grant, has not seen the ground, and mistakes the real reason for the failure:

"CAMP BEFORE VICKSBURG, *February* 3, 1863.

"MAJ.-GEN. W. T. SHERMAN:

"GENERAL:

* * * * * * * * * *

"While I admire your generosity in *assuming* the *responsibility* of the failure at Chickasaw Bayou, I must say that I do not regard it as just to yourself or friends that the blunders committed by inferior officers in the execution of your orders, and which were the direct cause of our repulse, should be laid to your charge or assumed by you.

* * * * * * * * * *

"Yours respectfully,

"FRANK P. BLAIR, *Brig.-Gen. Vols.*"

Here is a note of interest from the point of Grant's first victory:

"HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT WEST TENNESSEE,

"FORT DONELSON, *February* 21, 1862.

"GEN. W. T. SHERMAN, Commanding Department of Cairo, Paducah, Ill.:

"GENERAL: I am sending off the sick and wounded as rapidly as possible, and commenced doing so immediately after the battle. Owing, however, to the continuous wet and cold weather we are much retarded in the operation.

"I want to see as few citizens here as possible. They embarrass us very much. Ladies are still worse than men, and particularly if they are the wives of officers. I would esteem it a special favor if you would allow no officers' wives to come up except where the officers are wounded.

"I am at a loss to know what the next move is going to be. Yesterday I was in Clarksville, and expected by to-morrow week to be in Nashville. General Halleck's telegram indicates a different move. We want no more surgeons here.

"I am, General, very respectfully your obedient servant,

"U. S. GRANT, *Brig.-Gen.*"

There were few soldiers at Vicksburg in July of 1863 who did not readily see that Sherman's first attack from Chickasaw Bluffs, though positively ordered by Grant, was a loyal effort to do the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

impossible. That General Grant thought so too, afterwards, is shown by the following note to the President :

"HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE TENNESSEE,
"VICKSBURG, Miss., *July* 22, 1863.

"HIS EXCELLENCY A. LINCOLN, President of the United States :

"SIR :

* * * * * * * * * *

"General Sherman's management as commander of troops in the attack on Chickasaw Bluffs last December was admirable. Seeing the ground from the opposite side of the attack, I see the impossibility of making it successful. The conception of the attack on Arkansas Post was General Sherman's. His part of the execution no one denies was as good as it possibly could have been. His demonstration on Haine's Bluffs in April to hold the enemy about Vicksburg, whilst the army was securing a foothold east of the Mississippi, his rapid marches to join the army afterwards, his management at Jackson, Miss., in the first attack, his almost unequaled march from Jackson to Bridgeport and passage of that stream, his securing Walnut Hills on the 18th of May, and thus opening communication with our supplies, all attest his great merit as a soldier.

* * * * * * * * * *

"Your obedient servant,
"U. S. GRANT, *Maj.-Gen., U. S. A.*"

V.

General Grant's confidence that he had Lee as in a vise is shown by his note to Sherman, even before the last avenues of escape were closed :

"HEADQUARTERS ARMIES OF THE UNITED STATES,
"CITY POINT, Va., *March* 16, 1865.

"MAJ.-GEN. W. T. SHERMAN, Commd'g Mil. Div. of the Miss. :

"GENERAL :

* * * * * * * * * *

"The determination seems to be to hold Richmond as long as possible. I have a force sufficient to leave enough to hold our lines (all that is necessary of them), and move out with a plenty to whip his whole army. But the roads are entirely impassable. Until they improve I shall content myself with watching Lee, and be prepared to pitch into him if he attempts to evacuate the place. I may bring Sheridan over—think I will—and break up the Danville and South Side Railroads. These are the last avenues left to the enemy.

* * * * * * * * * *

"Very respectfully, your obedient servant,
"U. S. GRANT, *Lieut.-Gen.*"

VI.

General Grant's interest in the colored troops is evidenced by his choice of a commander at Vicksburg.

"HEADQUARTERS ARMIES OF THE U. S.,
"WASHINGTON, D. C., *April* 4, 1864.

"MAJ.-GEN. W. T. SHERMAN, Commanding Mil. Div. of the Miss.:

"GENERAL :

* * * * * * * * * *

"I suggested Slocum to command the district of Vicksburg, because there is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such a large proportion of colored troops in that district (more will be constantly organized) and Slocum will take an active *interest* in this work which the President and Secretary of War fear Newton will not. I do not join in this fear, but have not had the opportunity of having General Newton's views on the subject. He is evidently a soldier, and a soldier does not consult his own views of policy when orders from his superiors intervene.

* * * * * * * * * *

"I am, General, very respectfully your obedient servant,

"U. S. GRANT, *Lieut.-Gen.*"

VII.

The *real purpose* of Banks's campaign against Texas is shown in this note from General Halleck to General Grant. Whether good, in any sense, came of the politico-military fiasco is more than ever a matter of doubt.

"HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
"WASHINGTON, D. C., *January* 8, 1864.

"MAJOR-GENERAL U. S. GRANT, Comd'g, etc., etc., Chattanooga, Tenn.:

"GENERAL:

* * * * * * * * * *

"In regard to General Banks's campaign against Texas, it is proper to remark that it was undertaken less for military reasons than as a matter of *state policy*. As a military measure only, it perhaps presented less advantages than a movement on Mobile and the Alabama River, so as to threaten the enemy's interior lines and effect a diversion in favor of our armies at Chattanooga and in East Tennessee. But, however this may have been, it was deemed necessary as a matter of political or state policy, connected with our foreign relations, and especially with France and Mexico, that our troops should occupy and hold at least a portion of Texas. The President so ordered, for reasons satisfactory to himself and his Cabinet, and it was therefore unnecessary for us to inquire whether or not the troops could have been better employed elsewhere.

"I allude to this matter here as it may have an important influence on your projected operations during the present winter.

* * * * * * * * * *

"Very respectfully your obedient servant,

"H. W. HALLECK, *Gen.-in-Chief.*"

VIII.

The supersedure of General Rosecrans at Chattanooga by Thomas was left *optional* with General Grant, as is shown by the following from Halleck:

"HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
"WASHINGTON, D. C., *October* 16, 1863.

"MAJ.-GEN. U. S. GRANT, Louisville:

"GENERAL: You will receive herewith the orders of the President of the United States, placing you in command of the Departments of the Ohio, Cumberland and Tennessee. The organization of these Departments will be changed as you may deem most practicable. You will immediately proceed to Chattanooga

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and relieve General Rosecrans. You can communicate with Generals Burnside and Sherman by telegraph. A summary of the orders sent to these officers will be sent to you immediately. It is left *optional* with you to supersede General Rosecrans by Gen. G. H. Thomas or not. Any other changes will be made on your request by telegram.

"One of the first objects requiring your attention is the supply of your armies. Another is the security of the progress in the Georgia mountains to shut out the enemy from Tennessee and Kentucky. You will consult with General Meigs and Colonel Scott in regard to transportation and supplies.

"Should circumstances permit I will visit you personally in a few days for consultation.

"H. W. HALLECK, *Gen.-in-Chief.*"

These war letters will be continued. The next series will embrace letters from Grant, Sherman, Garfield, Thomas, Admiral Porter, Governor Tod, and others.

S. H. M. BYERS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR INEQUALITIES OF SUFFRAGE.

THE magnitude of the subject admits, in this article, only a hasty and dogmatic consideration of many of the points involved, while it demands more extended elucidation of others. There will, therefore, be very little of an argumentative nature attempted.

Few of the millions of voters who exercise their sovereign rights on election days have any knowledge of the fact that the laws under which they cast their ballots differ in any material respect from those governing all voters throughout the United States. But it may almost be said that the laws of no two States are alike. Nor are the differences between them slight. They vary as widely as the features, intonations, and provincialisms of the voters themselves. The wood-chopper of Michigan, who has been in the country but one year, the State three months, and the town or ward ten days, has just as much power in the selection of a President of the United States as the resident of Kentucky who, in order to vote, must be a citizen of the United States and have lived in the State two years, the town, city, or county one year, and the precinct sixty days.

When our forefathers framed the Constitution of the United States, it is doubtful if the most sanguine of them, in his wildest dreams, conceived of such a population as we have to-day, either in point of numbers or diversity of character. That they showed remarkable wisdom every one will admit, but the time has surely come when some of the laws to which they bound us should be carefully looked into. With the light of modern times upon them defects are to be found, which modern ideas alone can rectify.

The tremendous and ever-increasing development of the country has brought to our shores millions upon millions of foreigners, very largely from the lower and poorer classes of Europe, who have been crowded out, as it were, from their unattractive homes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the hard life and small prospect of advancement there offered. Thus we have an extremely heterogeneous population, which, while it adds to our strength ultimately, by the mixture of blood, unquestionably lowers the average of our moral and mental powers until such a time as the individual ignorance, want of acquaintance with our laws and customs, and absence of American ideas, has been overcome in each particular immigrant. Of course there are a vast number of foreigners and naturalized citizens in the country who rank among our most intelligent men, but they do not represent the mass of our foreign population.

The Constitution provides entirely different methods for the choice of the President and Vice-President, the members of the House of Representatives, and the members of the Senate of the United States. By it the power is almost absolutely given to the several States to determine the necessary qualifications of voters, except that race, color, or previous condition of servitude cannot abridge the right of *citizens* to vote.

Let us glance for a moment at the result. Citizenship of the United States is required by 21 States, while in 17 it is not required. Residence within the State limits for one year is demanded by 25 States; for six months, by 9; for three months, by 2; for four months, by 1; and for two years, by 1. The requirements as to the time the voter shall have lived in the election district, county, city, town, ward, and precinct are equally varied.

In four of the seventeen States that do not require citizenship a foreigner can vote after having been in the United States six months; in 11, one year; in 1, two years; and in 1, two and one-half years. Thirty-six States require no educational qualification, while two do, and in nine the payment of some sort of a tax is demanded. In five more no paupers are considered worthy of enfranchisement, while in twenty-four no property qualification whatever is considered necessary. These twenty-four are nearly equally divided between those which do and those which do not demand citizenship, there being eleven of the former and thirteen of the latter. Thus it is evident that of the fourteen requiring a property qualification ten do and four do not require citizenship.

As to the matter of the geographical distribution of the various requirements there is no distinction so absolute as to justify the idea of illiberality on the part of any particular section of the country, or unreasonable freedom in any other. Generally speak-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing, the Eastern and Middle States are more stringent in their requirements than the Southern and Western, but there are too many exceptions to admit of this being laid down as a rule.

Now that we have seen the condition of things as it exists, let us inquire whether or no it is desirable. And, in order to show how it is liable to operate, we will illustrate by hypothetical cases.

Three brothers X, Y, and Z, determine to emigrate to America. X and Y land in New York on October 15th, 1887. Z lands there on April 15th, 1888. X goes at once to Cincinnati, settles there, and declares his intention of becoming an American citizen. In the latter part of October, 1892, his business not being prosperous, he spends a month in traveling through various neighboring States in search of a more desirable location, and, during the last week of November, determines upon Covington, Kentucky, as his future home, and at once establishes himself there with his family within five miles perhaps of where he has lived ever since being in the country. Now, although he has become naturalized at the earliest possible moment, the first time that he will be able to vote for a member of Congress will be in November, 1896. He was unable to be in Ohio at the election of 1892, and in 1894 he had not lived in Kentucky the requisite two years.

Y goes to Minnesota, or any one of sixteen other States, and in the election of 1888 votes, perfectly legally, for the general ticket on which Mr. John Smith is a candidate for Member of Congress, and Smith is elected. Shortly after his election Mr. Smith finds that his health is failing, and, instead of returning to the State from which he was elected, he goes, say to California, makes his home there, and, naturally interested in politics, finds himself in 1890 a candidate for Congressional honors from California. Y has also moved there, and though a resident of the State for the prescribed term of one year, not being an American citizen he is unable to vote for Mr. Smith, though two years before in another State he had voted for him.

Z, the third brother of the family, who arrived in America six months later than X and Y, settles at once in Kansas, Nebraska, Oregon, or Colorado, and casts his first ballot in the fall election of the same year. He then moves to any other one of the seventeen States which do not require citizenship as a qualification of voters, and after each election moves again. In this way, by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time his brother X has voted once, he may have voted for five different Congressmen in as many different States.

This condition of things may not be apt to occur, but it is possible. Nor is this all. Other varying sources of disqualification are liable to be met with, namely, property and educational unfitness, and in one State—alas but one—the moral character of the voter is nominally required to be good. The enactment of such a law by a State Legislature may be considered by many a doubtful compliment to the inhabitants of the State; the State is certainly a doubtful one on election days.

Can any one claim for an instant that such a condition of affairs is just? The doctrine of state-rights is all very well when applied to the purely internal government of a State, and so long as, in its application, it infringes upon no individual rights. But, under the present law, the individual rights of a very large majority of the male population of the United States over twenty-one years of age are materially interfered with. If it is right that in one State the non-citizen resident should vote, it is equally right in every State, and the twenty-one States that require their voters to be citizens do their foreign residents a grievous wrong. On the other hand, if any State may justly require citizenship as a condition for enfranchisement, every State should require it. The seventeen States that allow non-citizens to vote are unjust to their own citizens, for they give them individually a less relative power in the councils of the nation than that possessed by the citizens of the twenty-one States which require citizenship.

In the same manner the inequalities of residence, whether in state, county, or precinct, of education, and of property, in fact of every sort, are fraught with injustice; and simply from the standpoint of equal rights should be done away with. There is, therefore, no equitable solution of the problem except in a common, all-governing law, so regulating the question of franchise that he who may vote in one State may, under similar conditions, vote in any other State. Just what that law should be is a momentous question, involving many points which demand the most careful consideration, the nicest discrimination between right and wrong, between measures politic and impolitic for the furtherance of the national honor and strength; and in considering them the lines of political parties should be utterly abolished; and woe to the party, whether Democratic or Republican, Labor or Tem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perance, which, for its own political furtherance, refuses to weigh the matter candidly and act honestly regarding it, with the best good of the entire nation as the crowning result to be aimed at.

The extremes are seen in, 1st, non-citizenship and short residence, with no education or property whatever; and, 2d, citizenship and longer residence, together with education and property. Between these two lie numerous conditions and combinations of conditions. Is it wise to accept either extreme, and if so, which? Let us consider them for a moment in their entirety, and see if either is likely to operate with justice to the greatest possible number of inhabitants; and, 2d, to serve in the best manner for the national good.

In discussing the desirability of a common law giving the right of franchise to alien residents, and reducing the requirements to a minimum, the first point to arise is, would it be just to the greatest possible number?

All residents may be divided into two classes,—citizens, native-born and naturalized, and aliens. Of these native-born citizens are in the large majority, which is greatly increased by the addition of those naturalized. Now, unquestionably, the average ability of American citizens is greater than that of alien residents, and therefore greater than of all residents, citizen and alien; and accordingly the restriction of the franchise to citizens could work no injury to aliens, whereas the enfranchisement of aliens can do no possible good to any one outside of the aliens themselves, who constitute a very small minority of the general public, and is liable to work untold injury to the large majority—the citizens of the Republic. Then, too, as to an educational qualification. The public school system of the United States places the knowledge, at least, of how to read and write, within the power of every American. Without this knowledge it is impossible for any person in a republic like ours to arrive at even a reasonable degree of information regarding the great questions of the day; and without some individual knowledge of what he is voting for, some tangible reason why he votes for or against any question or candidate, the voter is no better than one of a flock of sheep, and is led blindly by his party boss or master, a submissive tool in the hands of others, generally unscrupulous men, who care for him only so long as he can give them his vote. Now, why should the small minority, who, being utterly ignorant, cannot

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rationally inform themselves of the points at issue, be allowed to swell the power of one individual or party at the expense of others? Such an arrangement, on the very face of it, is unjust to the party or person against whom the ignorant vote.

The *justice* of the proposition that an educational qualification should be demanded of voters being incontrovertibly established, it is readily demonstrable that the best interests of the country demand it. A foreigner coming to our shores may have his own ideas of what he individually likes, but he cannot have as sound ideas of what is best for Americans generally as the man who was either born or brought up here, or has lived here long enough to become naturalized. Driven out of Europe, perhaps, by what he considers oppression, whether an anarchist, socialist, or nihilist, or simply a man dissatisfied with monarchical government, he is utterly unacquainted with true Republican methods and the needs of a government such as ours, until he has been here at least long enough to become a citizen. Consequently, his vote is more likely to be harmful than beneficial to the general public. The same is true of the totally uneducated.

The question of a property qualification is not so easily handled. Undoubtedly the householder, or the man who has landed property, is, generally speaking, a better citizen and more desirous of a pure, efficient, and economical management of affairs, a curtailment of taxes, than the one whose purse strings are not directly affected thereby. There is no way of appealing to a man's judgment so effectually as through his pocket. And yet there are a very large number of good American citizens, particularly among what are generally called "the laboring classes," who possess no real property and are unable to become possessors of any. It would not be a hardship, however, to require that all voters should pay a poll tax, and it might be wise to demand an additional property qualification, but it would lead to so much opposition at present, and is of so uncertain desirability, that it is not wise to advocate it at the outset of an effort for the reform of the laws of suffrage.

The subject of registration demands our next consideration, and is of the utmost importance. Fortunately, the large majority of the States demand it. In seven States, however, it is not required. It is the strongest safeguard we have against fraud, and should without hesitation be rigidly enforced in all.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the contrary, to residence within the State limits too much importance has been given. In these days of widespread and general railway travel, and diverse and extended business interests, the business man who lives to-day in California may next month have his home in New York, and the laborer now employed in New England may, before he knows it, be building a railroad in Arkansas or Nebraska. If these men are citizens of the United States, there is no reason why they should not change their legal residence as often as they change their habitat.

The only advantages of requiring a definite term of residence in any particular locality is the acquaintance with the local interests to be secured by the representatives of that locality in Congress and the Senate; and more particularly the ability of the officers of elections to preserve the purity of the ballot. For this purpose a prolonged residence within the limits of the State is not so important as a reasonably long residence in the voting precinct. Six, or even three, months in the State should be sufficient, but sixty days, or at the least six weeks, in the voting precinct should be required.

The proposition that criminals and paupers should be excluded, as they generally are, as unworthy of enfranchisement, needs no argument. It is self-evident, and will readily be conceded by all fair-minded persons.

Having thus seen the inequalities of suffrage, the need of removing them, and the desirable points to be retained, it remains to be discovered how it is best to establish an efficacious system.

It would unquestionably be well to have throughout the Union a common law, applicable to both State and National elections, were it not for the great inroad such a law would make upon the individual rights of States. An attempt to accomplish anything of the sort would raise such an opposition as to defeat the end in view, and it is a matter of grave doubt whether it would be wise to interfere so far with local State government.

Admitting the desirability then of uniformity in the qualifications of voters at National elections, and confining ourselves to National elections, two points become apparent: 1st. On days when elections take place for Presidential and Vice-Presidential electors, members of the U. S. Senate, and Representatives in Congress, or when balloting occurs regarding the adoption of Constitutional amendments, no other elections for local or State officers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should be allowed, for it would be impossible to distinguish between those qualified to vote under a United States law, and those who, by their State law, were competent electors of State and local officers. 2d. United States Senators should be chosen by the direct vote of the people. Otherwise, if elected, as at present, by the State Legislatures, they would, in point of fact, be the choice of men who in their different States received the vote of electors differently qualified. They would, therefore, hold office under unequal terms of enfranchisement.

In order to change the manner of election of United States Senators from a legislative to a popular vote, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is necessary; for Section IV. of the 1st Article of the Constitution specifically states that "Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations" regarding Congressional and Senatorial elections, "except as to the places of choosing Senators."

Congress, moreover, has no power, under the Constitution, to say *how* the Electors for President and Vice-President shall be chosen. It can only state the date of election. A constitutional amendment is therefore needed to accomplish this end.

Since it is necessary, therefore, to amend the Constitution in order to remedy so much of the defect in our present system of voting, it is best, in doing so, to recast the entire system, and embody in a series of amendments, that will cover the ground completely, such laws as will serve to distinctly define the position of the United States that, in regard to national affairs, only *duly qualified* citizens shall vote, embodying therein the qualifications. A series of amendments will serve the purpose better than one amendment covering the entire ground, because those States which might be willing to accept a part might oppose another part, and, different parts being opposed by different States, the adoption of the measure, if voted upon as a whole, might fail, while, if voted upon as different articles, the adoption of all, or at least a portion, of the amendments might be secured.

J. CHESTER LYMAN.

P. S.—The subjoined table shows the different suffrage requirements in the different States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NAME OF STATE.	Citizenship.	Time required in			Registrat'n.	Educational and property qualifications.
		State.	County.	Division of county.[6]		
Alabama.....	No.	1 yr.	3 mo.	w. or p., 30 days.	Yes.	No.
Arkansas.....	No.	1 yr.	6 mo.	w. or p., 30 days.	Yes.	No.
California.....	Yes.	1 yr.	90 d.	p., 30 days.	Yes.	No.
Colorado.....	No.	6 mo.	....	.....	Yes.	No.
Connecticut...	Yes.	1 yr.	....	t., 6 mos.	Yes.	Read state laws. Good moral character. Freehold yielding $7 annually, or pay state tax, or have done military duty.
Delaware.....	Yes.	1 yr.	1 mo.	.....	No.	No paupers, pay county tax.
Florida.....	No.	1 yr.	6 mo.	.....	Yes.	No.
Georgia.....	No.	1 yr.	6 mo.	.....	Yes.	Must have paid their taxes.
Illinois.....	Yes.	1 yr.	90 d.	e. d., 30 days.	Yes.	No.
Indiana.....	No.[2]	6 mo.	....	w. or p., 30 days.	No.	No.
Iowa.....	No.[3]	6 mo.	60 d.	t. or w., 10 days.	Yes.	No.
Kansas.....	No.	6 mo.	....	t. or w., 30 days.	Yes.	No.
Kentucky.....	Yes.	2 yrs.	Co., t. or c., 1 yr.; p. 60 d.		No.	No.
Louisiana.....	No.	1 yr.	....	pr., 10 days.	Yes.	No.
Maryland.....	Yes.	1 yr.	Co. or c., 6 months.		Yes.	No.
Maine.....	Yes.	3 mo.	....	.....	Yes.	No paupers or Indians.
Massachusetts..	Yes.	1 yr.	C. d., t. or c., 6 months.		Yes.	Read and write, no paupers have paid state or county tax.
Michigan.....	No.[4]	3 mo.	....	t. or w., 10 days.	No.	No.
Minnesota.....	No.[2]	4 mo.	....	e. d., 10 days.	Yes.	No.
Mississippi.....	Yes.	6 mo.	1 mo.	.....	Yes.	No.
Missouri.....	No.	1 yr.	Co., c. or t., 60 days.		Yes.	No.
Nebraska.....	No.	6 mo.	40 d.	w. or p., 10 days.	Yes.	No.
Nevada.....	Yes.	6 mo.	Co. or d., 30 days.		Yes.	No.
New Hampshire	Yes.	....	....	t., 6 months.	Yes.	Must be tax-pay'r
New Jersey.....	Yes.	1 yr.	5 mo.	.....	Yes.	No.
New York.....	Yes.	1 yr.	4 mo.	d., t. or w., 30 days.	Yes.	No.
North Carolina.	No.	1 yr.	30 d.	.....	Yes.	Must own 50 acres of land or have paid taxes
Ohio.....	Yes.	1 yr.	30 d.	t., v. or w., 20 days.	Yes.	No.
Oregon.....	No.	6 mo.	Co. or d., 90 days.		Yes.	No.
Pennsylvania...	Yes.[5]	1 yr.	e. d., 2 months.		Yes.	Must have paid state or co. tax within 2 years.
Rhode Island...	Yes.	1 yr.	t. or c., 6 months.		Yes.	Must own property in his town and pay taxes on it.
South Carolina.	Yes.	1 yr.	60 d.	.....	Yes.	No.
Texas.....	No.	1 yr.	Co. or e. d., 6 months.		No.	No paupers.
Tennessee.....	Yes.	1 yr.	6 mo.	.....	No.	Must pay poll tax.
Vermont.....	Yes.	1 yr.	....	t., 3 months.	No.	No.
Virginia.....	Yes.	1 yr.	Co., c. or t., 6 months.		Yes.	No paupers.
West Virginia..	Yes.	1 yr.	30 d.	.....	Yes.	No.
Wisconsin.....	No.	1 yr.	....	.....	Yes.	No paupers.

Notes.—[1] Compiled from Hill's Manual 1882. [2] Foreigners must be resident 1 year in United States. [3] Foreigners must be resident 2 years in the State. [4] Foreigners must be resident 2½ years in the State. [5] Former citizens returned from abroad vote after 6 months in State. [6] Co., county c., city; d., district; e. d., election district; c. d., congressional district; t., town or township; v., village; pr., parish; w., ward; p., precinct.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM IN NEW YORK.

THIS note was kindly furnished to me by Colonel Bliss in answer to a query as to his view of the proposed Constitutional Convention in the State of New YORK.—EDITOR.

I was out of the country during the canvass this autumn, but had I been here I should have opposed the calling of a convention. In my opinion, our Constitution needs very little of amendment, and the product of a convention elected just now is more likely to be evil by destroying things that are good in the present Constitution than good by reason of any beneficial changes that may be introduced. Still, I do not worry now that this convention is called, for I have not the remotest idea that its work will be accepted by the people. The truth is that while in theory the correct way to amend the Constitution is to submit the whole instrument to revision, and so make a congruous whole, yet, in fact, the practical way is by special amendments of particular sections. If you overhaul the whole constitution, and then submit it for approval as a whole to the people, you concentrate in opposition to it the separate interests or persons who are against specific sections or articles, and they together are pretty sure to be powerful enough to defeat the new instrument. It is really no slight objection, and one that will influence many, that when after forty years of judicial decision we have at last come to know precisely what our present constitution means, a revision would throw doubt even upon those provisions which are not directly amended.

Our Constitution has sixteen articles embracing 155 sections. I do not think there are a third of the articles into which the slightest amendment should be introduced.

It would probably be wise to put it in the power of the Legislature to provide for giving the minority some influence in elections, whether by cumulative voting, minority representatives, or in some other manner: not to enact these in the Constitution, but to give the Legislature power to try them. In that connection, care should be taken to provide in the Constitution itself for protecting the rights of the minority in the formation of Senate and Assembly districts. As it is now, the eighty or ninety thousand Republicans in New York city could be left entirely without representation in the legislature by the simple expedient, in making Senate and Assembly districts, of cutting the city up into slices, East and West, directly across the island. Only divisions in the Democracy, and personal influence with Mr. Kelly and other leaders of the party, have prevented this from being done hitherto.

I think the relief of the Court of Appeals is one of the most important things to be considered by the convention. There are on the calendar made up at the end of last May 935 cases. Of these there have been disposed of less than 150. The court cannot properly deal with more than 400 calendar cases in a year, if so many. This is in addition to criminal cases, which come up with a controlling

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preference, and are not on the present calendar, and motions, which take about two days in a month. Cases at the foot of the calendar, therefore, wait more than two years. This is a gross injustice, and is a direct encouragement to unwarranted appeals. I know cases on the present calendar where it is so certain that the decision below cannot be changed by an appeal, that I am confident, when they are reached, two or more years hence, the decision below will be affirmed by default. Moreover, there must be already 200 more cases which would be in the Court of Appeals if a new calendar was made up now.

The convention won't do it, but it would be an eminently wise thing to sell the State salt-lands at Syracuse. They are very valuable, but produce substantially no income to the State, and are a source of patronage, if not of jobbery. Formerly there was, perhaps, a reason for keeping them in the hands of the State to prevent a monopoly, but now that salt-springs have been opened in Michigan and elsewhere in the West, there is no force in the cry of monopoly. If there was, the system under which the salt works at Syracuse are conducted gives a practical monopoly to a few manufacturers.

I have no faith that, by any amendment of the Constitution, any way would be opened to an improvement in our municipal government, beyond that which may be obtained through an enlargement of the rights and powers of the minority. The Legislature has now, I think, the power to do all that is valuable which can be practically done in that direction by Constitution or legislation, except, perhaps, the prevention of the passage of laws intended to meet special cases under the guise of general acts. It does not seem to me that the scheme of requiring a uniform charter for all cities can be successful.

So far as New York city is concerned, I think it would be a good thing to make it possible to place in the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund the powers now possessed by the Aldermen with reference to grants for street railways. When the general railroad act of 1884 was before Governor Cleveland for his approval, I called his attention to the clause giving the power to the Aldermen, and urged him then to insist upon having the bill recalled by the Legislature for the purpose of an amendment which should superimpose upon the consent of the Aldermen the approval of the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund as to the terms of the grant. This was all that I thought could be done under the present Constitution without an entire change in the distribution of powers in the city government. I predicted to Governor Cleveland that the result of the bill as it stood would be to make an auction room of the Aldermanic Chamber. My suggestion met the Governor's approval, and he intended to act upon it, but he thought he found that if the bill was returned to the Legislature it would not again pass, and he preferred to sign it, though he saw the objection to the clause, because he thought a general street railroad law an absolute necessity. The consent of the Commissioners of the Sinking Fund is now required to the leasing of any land to or by the city, and there would be consistency in letting them fix the term of any grant to occupy the streets with railroad tracks. If the subject of street railroads is touched in the Convention, I think provision should be made by which only a single track can be placed in our ordinary cross streets, so that cars may run on one street going one way and on a parallel one going the other. This would go far to minimize objections to tracks in streets.

GEORGE BLISS.

II.

A REJOINDER TO GENERAL BEAUREGARD, BY ADMIRAL TAYLOR.

IN the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for October, 1886, Gen. G. T. Beauregard has replied at length to my statement in the July number of the same year

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His attempt to throw discredit upon that statement demands some remarks from me, which, in order to meet all his points, I am compelled to make more extended than I would wish.

The matter in question is his article in the May number of the REVIEW, of 1886, which is based upon his proclamation of the 31st January, 1863, declaring the blockade of Charleston "to be raised by a superior force of the Confederate States," and what appears as an *addendum* to the proclamation, called "results of the engagement." (Report of the Secretary of the Navy for 1863, pages 178–179.)

General Beauregard maintains the correctness of his assertion, and says, "I never even intimated that because the Federal blockading fleet was dispersed, north and south, on the 31st January, 1863, by the Confederate rams 'Palmetto State' and 'Chicora,' the Charleston blockade was permanently broken, and remained so to the end. I said that 'for the time being' it was raised." This is true as regards his statement of May, 1886; but compare this declaration with the proclamation itself, which is the only document that has come to my knowledge which was, to use General Beauregard's own words, "certified to by Commodore Ingraham, by the foreign consuls then in Charleston, and by myself."

"At about the hour of five o'clock this morning, the Confederate States naval forces on this station attacked the United States blockading fleet off the harbor of the city of Charleston, and sunk, dispersed, and drove off out of sight for the time, the entire hostile fleet. Therefore we, the undersigned, commanders respectively of the Confederate States naval and land forces in this quarter, hereby formally declare the blockade by the United States of the said city of Charleston to be raised by a superior force of the Confederate States, from and after this 31st day of January, A. D. 1863."

If this declaration was not intended to convey the idea that the blockade was *permanently* raised, there is no value in language. The ships, he says, were driven off "for the time." But he makes no reservation as to the permanence of the blockade, but declares it to be raised from and after the date mentioned. He appears to have forgotten what all authorities on international law affirm, that a blockade once broken by a superior force cannot be re-established except by due notification to foreign countries, and after an established interval of time. The blockade of Charleston continued uninterrupted, without notification of any kind, and was always respected by foreign powers.

A few days after the attack of the rams, an English frigate (28 gun ship) appeared off the harbor, and was permitted to cross the bar. She anchored just outside of Fort Sumter, and remained there some days. Her captain had every opportunity of communicating with the city, and of meeting his consul, and of ascertaining all the facts relating to the sortie. I met this officer in company with the commander of H. B. M. ship "Petrel," on board the U. S. S. "Powhatan," during his stay. He showed me a copy of the Charleston *Courier*, mentioned in my article of July last in the REVIEW, which I asked him to give me, as it contained the account of the doings of the "Chicora" on the 31st of January. He regretted that he could not do so, as he wished to take it to Washington for the information of the British Minister there. As no action was taken by that functionary, it seems evident that in his opinion General Beauregard's proclamation was unfounded.

I now re-affirm every assertion, and reiterate every denial made in my report of the engagement, dated 31st January, 1863, and in the certificate of the "Officers commanding various vessels of the blockading squadron off Charleston," dated 10th February, 1863, as well as every declaration contained in my article in the July number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Beauregard's remarks as to "contradictory statements and denials," though intended for "General Sherman, Rear Admiral Taylor, and others," apply equally to General Beauregard himself.

Col. A. A. Lechler, who is referred to somewhat sarcastically as "the Colonel of a Pennsylvania Militia Regiment," and whose "officious zeal" induced him to address a letter to Admiral Du Pont, nowhere "indirectly admits," as General Beauregard says he does, "that he was never near the scene of action, and was merely passing on a transport, at some distance off Charleston harbor, when he encountered the Federal fleet, evidently after its dispersion." On the contrary, he expressly declares that he found the blockading squadron, on his arrival off the harbor, lying there, some of the vessels at anchor. The distance from the land was estimated to be from four to five miles. The morning was somewhat hazy, but the land could be plainly seen on each side of the harbor, and by the aid of a glass a fort, said to have been Sumter, was visible. He was right in the midst of the fleet. And he concludes by saying, "Being thus near the site of the engagement, and so soon after it came off (he arrived there about half past eight), we do not hesitate in the least to pronounce the statement that the blockade was raised, not only absurd, but utterly and willfully false." (For this letter see the Secretary's Report for 1863, pages 179–180.)

The position in which the blockading vessels were found by Colonel Lechler was almost identical with that in which we were left by the "Chicora" when she retreated across the bar. It was the same point to which the "Housatonic" ran, after slipping her cable, to engage the "Chicora."

It is impossible to conjecture what vessels were pursued "six or seven miles seaward" by Commander Tucker. The "Mercedita" had surrendered and the "Keystone State" was disabled. The only other vessels at that point were the "Quaker City" and "Memphis." Those two, therefore, were all that *could have been* chased off. Yet both of these vessels were quite near the "Housatonic" when the firing between that vessel and the "Chicora" was going on, and the latter was crossing the bar. The two schooners and the brig that Commander Tucker engaged are not to be accounted for. No such vessels were present. The "bark-rigged propeller" must have been the "Housatonic," which did engage the "Chicora," though the latter was retreating to the bar, and was far in shore of the "Housatonic" when she came up and commenced firing. The former made no attempt to come to close action.

After the "Chicora" had got out of range, there remained near the bar the "Housatonic," "Quaker City," and the "Augusta," all of which took part in the engagement. The "Flag," "Ottawa," and "Stettin" were at their usual stations. The "Unadilla" was on her way down from her station inside of Rattlesnake Shoal. The "Memphis" had the "Keystone State" in tow for Port Royal. The extract from the log-book of the "Housatonic" will show how all the vessels except the two last named were employed during the day. (Secretary's Report for 1863, pages 172–174.)

When the intelligence of this affair reached Admiral Du Pont, he sent the two oldest officers under his command, viz., Captains Thos. Turner and S. W. Godon, to investigate the whole matter. The report of the former is worthy of attention, and it may be found on page 176 of the Secretary's report for 1863. It was at this time that the indignant protest of the "Officers commanding various vessels of the blockading squadron" was drawn up. He says: "It is with unaffected pain that I am called upon to forward a document reflecting so severely, but justly, upon functionaries holding the high position of consuls, and one of them, if this statement has been made by his authority, the commander of a vessel of war

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of her Britannic Majesty. Nor can I account for it in any other way than being a premeditated act on their part, with foregone conclusions, to draw up a report that would prejudice our cause in the eyes of the world, or that these events were seen by them with the distorted optics of prejudiced or partisan witnesses." These remarks, taken in connection with those of General Beauregard on page 415 of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for October, appear significant. The latter says: "It was clearly my duty, under the circumstances, to take advantage of an opportunity which might have so materially benefited the Confederate cause in the eyes of foreign powers."

The two Confederate rams, according to General Beauregard, were hampered with several obstacles to success: "First, the weakness of their machinery; second, their very heavy and objectionable draught; and third, the fact that neither could be looked upon as altogether seaworthy." If this were the case, their commanders could not have anticipated any brilliant result. An inference might fairly be drawn that the sortie was intended merely as a demonstration, to give a coloring to an anticipated proclamation.

General Beauregard is in error when he says that I transformed Commander Le Roy's action in re-hoisting his colors and resuming fire on the enemy into "a praiseworthy effort on the part of the officer commanding the 'Keystone State,' and, singularly enough, throws the whole odium of the breach of faith on Commander Tucker." If he will again examine my words, he will find that I made no statement, nor uttered any opinion whatever. I simply gave Commander Le Roy's version of the affair. But I now unhesitatingly declare my belief that he was perfectly right in what he did. It is impossible that he could have committed any "faithless act" to place him "beyond the pale of civilized or honorable warfare." Chivalrous to the highest degree, Commander (now Rear Admiral) Le Roy needs no indorsement, no defense of any kind. His bare statement is a sufficient guarantee for accuracy, to all who know him.

As regards what Capt. W. H. Parker says of General Beauregard's proclamation, it was cited by me merely as his "opinion," and not as "an historical fact." Captain Parker was doubtless considered an officer of intelligence, professional ability, and devotion to the Confederate cause, or he would not have held the position he did on the day in question. His "opinion" is therefore entitled to much weight, particularly as his sympathies, it may be assumed, would have inclined him to approve, if he could have done so. He must "have seen what others failed to see," notably General Beauregard and his foreign sympathizers; for he declares that "as we entered the harbor, the Federal vessels closed in and resumed the blockade." The blockaders were all at their posts, and I presume they might have been seen by any eyes desirous, or even willing, to see them. The Charleston paper quoted in the report of the Secretary of the Navy for 1863, on page 178, says that on the 31st January, "late in the evening, four blockaders reappeared, keeping far out." Thus we have two statements that the blockading vessels were in sight from Charleston harbor on the afternoon of the 31st January, though General Beauregard declares in his statement that "not a Federal sail was visible, even with spy-glasses, for over twenty-four hours."

General Beauregard's concluding remark, that the "Federal blockading fleet was rendered so uneasy and inefficient by the results of the attack made upon it, on the 31st January, 1863, that for days and weeks afterward it was a matter of no difficulty for blockade-runners to enter or leave the port with almost entire freedom," is simply amusing. They must have received a terrible fright if they could have remained so demoralized for days and weeks. On page 416 of the REVIEW for October, he admits that the "officers in command of the ships com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

posing the blockade of Charleston were unquestionably gallant officers." If what he calls the "results of the attack" were true, they would appear in a totally different character. The simple fact is that the blockade runners, skillfully commanded, of great speed, very low in the water, painted of a dull grey color, and having choice of time, weather, and tide, had a great advantage over the blockading vessels. A very large proportion, it is frankly admitted, "succeeded in eluding the closest blockade of a coast ever maintained," as Admiral Porter defines it on page 685 of his "Naval History of the Civil War." And on page 18, he gives us the astonishing results of our vigilance.

In quoting General Beauregard's article in the REVIEW for May, 1886, in my reply of July, the word "entire" was substituted, by mistake of the printer, for "outer." We never claimed to have possession of the "entire harbor" at any time prior to Admiral Du Pont's attack in April, 1863.

To show how General Beauregard's proclamation was valued in Great Britain, where more sympathy was felt for the Confederates than for the United States, I feel that I may be excused from quoting from the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1866, page 216, notwithstanding the personal allusion to myself.

"Admiral Du Pont transferred his flag to the 'Ironsides,' which had been lately sent to aid him in the attack. She arrived just in time to complete the efficiency of the blockade, which had been for a few hours put in jeopardy by two small Confederate rams, the 'Chicora' and 'Palmetto State,' which issued from the harbor before daybreak on the 31st of January, designing to surprise the Federal squadron. The 'Mercedita,' the first vessel run into by them, was totally disabled, and surrendered. But meanwhile the alarm spread rapidly, and the project failed. After engaging and inflicting considerable damage on the 'Keystone State,' the next of the gunboats, the assailants yielded to the resolute advance of Captain Taylor (the senior Federal officer), in his steamship, the 'Housatonic,' supported by the 'Quaker City,' 'Memphis,' and 'Augusta,' and returned to the protection of the forts, claiming a success for what was, in fact, a failure, caused by their small tonnage and slow speed."

In conclusion, I assert most emphatically that the blockade of Charleston was never raised, for one moment, by the "Palmetto State" and "Chicora," General Beauregard's proclamation and subsequent declarations to the contrary, notwithstanding.

WM. ROGERS TAYLOR.

III.

WORKING WOMEN.

THERE are in the United States 2,647,157 women who earn their own living. Of this number 2,242,252 are classed in the following occupations: laborers, mainly agricultural, mill operatives, seamstresses, domestic servants, and teachers—with the exception of the last the most menial and worst paid of employments. In any of these industries it would be a low estimate to say that the supply of workwomen is ten times greater than the demand. This statement will be amply corroborated by the experience of any establishment which employs women in large numbers, or by the personal experience of any one who seeks the services of a workwoman in any of these capacities.

Thus we find a social condition, which, while obliging nearly 3,000,000 women to depend upon their own exertions for a livelihood, offers them a field of labor so circumscribed as to afford employment for not more than one-tenth of the number. Enormous overcrowding, fierce competition, and a consequent undue pressure upon wages must necessarily follow such a state of things.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The five industries mentioned contain the following number of women: laborers, 600,080; mill operatives, 152,163; domestic servants, 938,910; seamstresses, 334,026; teachers, 154,375. Those classed as laborers are chiefly found in the Southern States, and include, of course, a large number of negro women, although the sight of white women working in the fields is a familiar one to the traveler, especially in the States of Tennessee and Kentucky. Thousands of women are also employed as porters and laborers in stores and warehouses in the large cities of the North.

The number of women given as mill operatives includes only those engaged in textile manufactures, but the number engaged in other manufactories would greatly swell these figures. Twenty years ago, there were not 300 women employed in cigar manufacture; to-day there are 19,884 in the tobacco industries, and the number is rapidly increasing. The trade of cigar-making is injurious to men, but fearful in its effects upon the health of women and children.

Twenty-one thousand and seven women are employed as boot and shoe makers. In this industry they do the binding, sewing-on of buttons, etc., which is paid by the piece and very poorly. In all these manufacturing pursuits women are restricted to the meaner sort of work, and rarely rise to positions of trust, skill, or management. The chief requirement of their work is a certain manual dexterity, which is as easily acquired by a child as a woman, consequently the wages and qualifications of the woman are kept at the level of those of a child. Under this system, factory women must remain in the lowest grade of employment; the experience and trustworthiness of maturer years are of no use in bettering their condition. It is, therefore, not strange that we find so many factory women wanting in that intelligence, energy, and spirit which accompany a sense of responsibility and trust.

Nothing is more effectual in producing abjectness of character and deadening the moral and intellectual nature than a mean, servile condition which holds out no hope of change or improvement, and in which the compensation is insufficient to afford the means of a comfortable living.

We may well argue a prevailing state of public ignorance regarding the evils of working women's condition, when one of the daily papers of this city uses, as an argument in favor of their present position in industry, the fact that 45 per cent. of the employés in numerous manufacturing enterprises are women. The beasts of burden, or the steam which furnishes the motive power, are as much a factor in the exercise of any intelligent, thinking purpose as the women employed in these industries. And although the number of women in these pursuits should be doubled, filling the places in them they now do, the evil would only be increased and intensified.

Trade-unions have become a recognized power in determining, in great measure, the hours and wages of workingmen. By means of thorough organization they now form a large and powerful class, whose claims are met with respectful consideration by employers. But this protest of labor against oppression of all sorts is practically unavailable to women. As an eminent English writer says: "The stripes of workingmen are feared; those of workingwomen laughed at." This fact is recognized by the employer, who well knows that he can buy his labor cheaper from unorganized than from organized labor.

Carroll D. Wright, U. S. Com. of Labor, makes the following strong statement on the condition of women in the cotton mills: "What are these women but the very weakest and most dependent of all the people? They have no disposition to agitate. All that is possible to them is to toil, scrimp, and bear. Now for men, the strong, those who bear rule, the sovereigns of the land, the *hours of labor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are but ten all over the country in about every employment where they preponderate. But where the women and children preponderate the hours of labor, as a rule, are *eleven or more.* And the question is, why is it, in this land, which aims at equality and justice, that the weakest, the most helpless and dependent, are loaded with the more hours, while the strong, the able-to-bear, and the controlling ones have the less hours to work ?"

Many noble societies, even in this city, have been founded for the amelioration of the condition of factory operatives, but these do not reach the cause of the evil. It is justice, not charity, these women want from society. The even-handed goddess is the only reformer that can reach the root of these and many other social wrongs. The woman who effects the promotion of one capable factory woman to a position of trust and management, has done more to elevate and give encouragement to the whole class than would she, who should organize a score of dilettante charities for their benefit.

The trades dependent upon the needle form a history of human misery unequaled by the industrial condition of any working class the world has ever seen. Is not Hood's Song of the Shirt so pitiful in that it is so true ? Here, too, women suffer from the same want of organization, the same eager competition born of overcrowding, the same low wages that mark the other leading occupations. It is true that the best of skilled labor commands good wages, and the fashionable dressmakers often acquire a competency, but these are but a handful compared to the vast army of needle-women who work for a mere pittance. The influences which tend to depress woman's industrial condition bear the most fearful significance in the lower grades of its workers,—the sewing woman who makes a heavy pair of working pantaloons for *seven cents*, and by working continuously at the machine can make ten pairs in a day of from 12 to 15 hours. Provided no time is lost, their average weekly wages are $3.80, but to reach even this sum they are obliged to work *seven* full days, only occasionally taking Sunday afternoon for a holiday. The condition of the shirt makers is still worse ; they receive but 6 to 8 cents apiece, and can earn only from 30 to 50 cents a day. Vests are made for 3 to 6 cents apiece. Miserable attics and cellars form the only homes of these women, and their tenure even of these is precarious, depending upon the uncertain fortunes of an employment in which, owing to the enormous overcrowding, the most frivolous reason serves as a pretext for a dismissal. Such a woman's food is insufficient and unwholesome, her clothing of the meanest description, and if she have a best dress for Sundays or holidays it is often in the pawn shop to meet the exorbitant rent she is obliged to pay for even her wretched tenement. A cloak maker, who, with a friend, occupies two rooms on the top floor of a large tenement house on the East Side, states that they never have a warm meal or meat except for their Sunday dinner. The remainder of the week they subsist on bread and tea or milk. She also added that they were better off than many other sewing women. And yet it is work demanding experience, skill, and taste in its higher departments, and requiring neatness, deftness of hand, and care in all. Its products are among those most in demand ; the garments of the women and children of the wealthy classes are marvels of beauty and workmanship, while the changing dictates of fashion require the constant services of the sewing women. The question naturally arises, Why then are the wages of seamstresses so shamefully low and the struggle for existence so tragic for them ? It must be obvious to the most superficial observer that, even with the present excess of supply over demand in this branch of work, thorough organization could effect much in raising the wages of needlewomen. But here the greed of monopoly is limited by no restrictions or resistance. The poor sewing woman, isolated in the midst of a great city, falls an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

easy prey to this gigantic evil of modern society. The multiplication of stores of ready-made clothing means an increase of the system which allows the manufacturer to grind down the wages of "slop work" to the pittance which merely enables the sewing women to exist,—to live in any sense that implies a rational existence she does not. To these women even the lowest wages of the workman would mean riches and abundance. And yet it is the man who complains the most loudly and effectually. Michelet says that the workman needs so many more things than the workwoman that one could say of them what is said of the English and Irish laborers, "The Irishman when he is hungry asks only for potatoes; but the hungry Englishman demands meat, sugar, tea, and above all beer."

The position of domestic servant possesses many advantages over the condition of a factory or sewing woman, both by the increased comfort and cleanliness of its surroundings and its better compensation. But in no other employment do we hear more bitter complaints of inefficiency. This is almost wholly due to the fact that, in the city, domestic servants are mostly drawn from the tenement-house districts or the newly landed immigrants from Castle Garden, who, without previous training, are expected to perform skillfully the complicated duties of a modern household. With the best intentioned, proficiency is only gained by many failures and long experience, while the more thriftless and careless go to swell the ranks of inefficient servants who, being always in search of a place, serve to keep wages at the lowest rates. But if girls were trained for domestic servants as boys are trained to become carpenters and masons, the work would speedily command the consideration and wages that other skilled labor does in the market.

Upon women possessing wealth, leisure, and influence, must the evils of the present state of domestic service chiefly rest, since they have it in their power, not only to provide themselves with skilled servants by organizing and encouraging schools of cookery and other branches of domestic economy, but of becoming benefactors to thousands of their own sex by raising domestic service to the rank of a skilled employment.

And yet to enter domestic service is one of the most common remedies proposed for bettering the condition of working women. Do the advocates of domestic service ever stop to consider that it is one of the employments open to women which is already crowded to its utmost capacity, and that to precipitate any more untrained women into a field of labor which does not afford any adequate means of training for those already there would be a most disastrous remedy for the evils which now prevail? Nearly a million women are filling the position of domestic servants, and yet the intelligence offices are crowded and every advertisement brings scores of applicants. It is better servants that are needed, not greater numbers. Another evil in the working woman's condition arises from the fact that however hard she may work she cannot, at the present rate of wages in the occupations fully open to her, hope to save money. It is with the greatest difficulty she can provide for the immediate wants of the present; thus all openings which require the smallest amount of capital are closed to her. A man, starting at the lowest round of the industrial ladder, can, by habits of steady industry, thrift, and economy, rise to the highest position in his trade or profession, can look forward to the pleasures of a comfortable home, of educating his children, and enjoying a competency in his old age. But for the working woman there exists no such plans or hopes. The hopelessness of her condition is one of its saddest features.

IDA M. VAN ETTEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IV.

"THE SOUTH IN THE UNION ARMY."

AN article by "Felix A. Reeve," in the REVIEW of November last, makes comparisons between certain Northern and Southern States, as to their relative patriotism during the war of the rebellion, as evidenced by the respective numbers of troops furnished by the States referred to. Some time since, almost precisely the same argument appeared as an editorial in *Harper's Weekly*, in which the same figures were given, and the same comparisons made, and the alleged result treated as a most curious and surprising fact which had so far escaped attention. If such alleged statistics, which are so distorted as to produce fictitious results, are to pass unchallenged, we may soon see it proven by figures, "which cannot lie," that the South alone suppressed the rebellion.

Your correspondent compares the percentage of soldiers furnished by several States upon the basis of the total number of men of military age in those States, according to the census of 1860. He makes his comparisons more particularly between Delaware and Vermont, and, as the facts will give almost the same results between any or all of the States he refers to—that is, between the border slave States on the one hand and some of the strongest Republican States of the North on the other—I will, to avoid the repetition of the same class of figures, confine myself mainly to the two States mentioned.

Mr. Reeve states that Delaware furnished 13,670 soldiers out of a population of 18,000 white males of military age, being 75 per cent., while Vermont furnished only 58 per cent. of her like population.

It is well known that the quota of soldiers called for by the War Department from each State was based upon the number of males liable to military duty in each State, and that the method of ascertaining this number was in all States the same. Now, if Mr. Reeve had examined further the tables of the Adjutant General's office, whence all these figures come, he would have found that the total quota of Vermont was 32,074 men, while the State furnished 34,639 soldiers, and that the quota of Delaware was 13,935, while she furnished 13,670 soldiers. Now, either his figures are incorrect, or else the Government inflicted a great wrong upon the "heroic little State," as Mr. Reeve terms Delaware, in requiring her to furnish an undue proportion of troops. So with the other States he refers to. The comparison, as he makes it, is always in favor of the Southern State. But the record shows that Massachusetts was called on for 139,095 soldiers, and sent 146,730 to the field. Rhode Island's quota was 18,898, and she sent 23,286. That of Illinois was 244,496, and she furnished 259,092; of Kansas 12,931, while she furnished 20,149 soldiers.

Of the Border Slave States, Kentucky's quota was 100,782; she furnished 75,760. That of Maryland was 70,965, while she sent 46,638.

It would seem that either these figures or those of Mr. Reeve are wrong, but both are correct. It is in his deductions that he disproves the old saying that "figures cannot lie;" for they can be made to pervert the truth to a remarkable degree.

He says that Delaware had only about 18,000 *white males* in 1860, yet she sent 13,670 *men* into the Union army. In this distinction lies the secret of the curious result he arrives at. Delaware had in 1860 22,000 *men* of military age, but of these 4,000 (in round numbers) were colored. Vermont could not have raised an infantry company of black men if she had conscripted every negro within her borders.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Reeve states that the Border and Slave States furnished over 350,000 white soldiers to the Union, and nearly 100,000 blacks.

The truth is, and the record shows, that these States furnished a little over 350,000 *men*, while the colored troops not credited to the States numbered 93,441, and the total of colored troops was 186,097, the difference of 92,656 being credited upon the quotas of the several States furnishing them, and, consequently all, or nearly all, being included in the 350,000 men credited to the Border States.

Yet Mr. Reeve, by his peculiar process of arithmetic, calculates the percentage that this 350,000 soldiers—over one-fourth negroes—bears to the *white males* of military age in the Border States, and compares it with similar estimates from the Northern States, in which the colored factor is missing entirely.

Having arrived at these remarkable conclusions, Mr. Reeve bases upon them an argument, the gist of which is that without the assistance of the loyal men of the South the government could not have suppressed the rebellion. This is, perhaps, true; for the services of the Union men of the Border States will never be fully known, and cannot be too highly appreciated.

But it is also true that if the Union sentiment in the North had been as strong as was the secession sentiment in the States of the Confederacy, it would not have taken four years to break down the rebellion. With the Knights of the Golden Circle in the West, and the anti-draft rioters in the East, and the thousands of "copperheads" all through the North, the "left wing of Lee's army" was a greater menace to the success of the Union arms than all the Union men south of Mason and Dixon's line were to the South.

It has become fashionable with a certain class of writers of the North to belittle the achievements of their own section during the war. Some are those men who, in search of that political purity which will better agree with their delicate organisms, have left the party of Grant, Garfield, and Logan, and, having sought new affiliations in the company of those whom for years they have denounced as traitors, are now seeking to justify themselves by discovering heretofore unseen merits in their new friends, and similarly unknown faults in their old ones. Then we have the generals who went to the rear during the war. According to these gentry Grant was always doing the wrong thing, Sherman was a "crank" and a falsifier, and Sheridan a mere accident, while all the truly great generals who could have won battles upon strictly military lines were in retirement.

We might take counsel of the South in this respect. Admitting, as do most of the men of that section, that secession was an error, and vying with the North in their present devotion to the old flag, they love and honor their leaders, and revere the memory of Lee, Jackson, and Hood. They look back with pardonable pride upon the military prowess of the South, while it is left for the pessimists of the North to discredit their own people, and to belittle the services of their great leaders, and of the rank and file, who achieved the results that saved a nation.

A. P. MOREY.

V.

MR. CONWAY'S DRESS-COAT KING.

I MAY misapprehend the object, fail to follow the reasoning, and entirely miss the deduction of the contributor of the article entitled "Our King in Dress Coat" in your current number—probably I do—but having read it twice, it has brought me to a higher and more patriotic appreciation of the simplicity and perpetuity of American institutions than I heretofore possessed, and in proportion to that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

improvement of my education am I indebted to the author. His language, together with a thoughtful retrospect of my personal experience and my reading, saves me from the abyss of despondency into which he seeks to plunge any man who had been careless enough to believe that the American Constitution for more than a century has proved good enough to live and prosper under in times of peace, or to fight under and win everlasting and indispensable victories in times of war. Never before have I felt such veneration for the "framers." Think of it! What have we escaped? Briefly stated, your contributor furnishes us with this category: At a reception given by President Andrew Jackson, "there was ice-cream, and I saw a number of people breathing over their spoons in order to melt it before putting it into their mouths"—Horrible! And yet the American Constitution survived, though the constitutions of the guests may have suffered.

Again, President Andrew Johnson was "a drunken ruffian who staggered about the country vomiting vulgarest abuse on the people and Congress." Yet when the debauch was over, somebody else took up the Constitution just where he had left it. Shocking, indeed, is it, according to your contributor, that it should be an element of success in a presidential campaign that one of the candidates "lived in a log cabin, or split rails, or traveled a tow path;" though hardly as shocking as the parallel with which he cynically follows it in the next line, "Was not the Son of God a carpenter, born in a stable?" Does he forget that the simple minded boys of the log cabin, these rail splitters, these mule drivers, shone at the bar, graduated at universities, and were giants in debate?

Lamenting the bad taste of the people in selecting military in preference to civilian presidents, he concedes that "one statesman *was* indeed elected, but could not take his seat against two generals in possession." This, of course, refers to that able and eminent American, Samuel J. Tilden, who was statesman enough to concede the right of Congress, under the Constitution, to appoint an impartial tribunal to count the vote upon an extraordinary occasion, but who was never coward enough to confess that "he could not take his seat against two generals in possession."

If, as stated by your contributor, John Stuart Mill displayed his ignorance of the literature of the age by expressing wonder "that among Americans there had been developed no school of critics and reformers of the Constitution," I hope it may *continue* to be a subject of wonder, rather than that critics should write simply to see themselves in print, and write nothing but "words." When any fair criticism of the American Constitution is produced by your contributor, I trust he will keep before him the definition of Lord Bolingbroke, that "the Constitution is the rule by which the sovereign *ought* to govern at all times; and government is that by which he *does* govern at any particular time;" while he looks back a hundred years for an instance of a willful and unquestioned violation of the American Constitution by the President; and when he approaches the subject of "The Executive" let him forget and regret that he ever wrote that "the phenomenon of an American potentate, stronger and less responsible than any other monarch in the world, has often been remarked, but not explained," and instead thereof let him find room in his memory for the many rebukes administered by the people, the Congress, and the Judiciary, in all cases of alleged unlawful exercise of power by the President, all of which has been accomplished under and by virtue of "The American Constitution." Respectfully,

CHARLES H. T. COLLIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VI.

THE BEST WORK OF FALSE FAITHS.

APROPOS of Gail Hamilton's article entitled "Good Works of False Faiths," in the January number of the REVIEW, permit me to say a word about what seems to me the best work of these same "false faiths."

Never has there been in the history of the Christian religion such universal tolerance as there is at the present day. Every denomination has broadened. Unitarian meets Episcopalian; Episcopalian, Presbyterian; Presbyterian, Methodist, and all meet Romanist in a spirit which a short time ago would have seemed incredible. This tolerance began practically with Schleiermacher in Germany. Thence it extended into England. Our own great divines have caught the spirit of the age; and their respective congregations, wondering at first, but soon becoming reconciled to the new order of things, have peacefully followed their leaders. Scientists declare that the change is due to scientific influence; philosophers, that it is only another evidence of a growing and perfecting civilization; while not a few maintain that Christianity has reached this broad outlook by her own peculiar and inherent power. There seems to me, however, to be another cause which has also done its share toward producing these results, and that is these same "false faiths." Within a few years—the years in which tolerance has become general—we have given to oriental religions much careful and sympathetic study. In this study we have naturally compared these religions with our own, and by this comparison we have discovered that much of that ethical greatness and sweetness which we, in our bigotry, thought to belong to Christianity alone, has lived for centuries in the religions of the East. Brahminism, with its subtle philosophy, and its worship of the infinite and absolute; Buddhism, with its strict code of morals, its charity, its tolerance; Zoroasterism, with its reverence and filial love, have indeed been revelations to us who have been taught to believe that the Orient is a region of corruption, and that all faiths save Christianity are, as the early fathers of the Church denounced them, "the works of the devil." To this oriental study then, is largely due the spirit of the age; for, by seeking the good in other religions, we have not only come to see more clearly the good in our own religion, but our mind and hearts have been broadened by the very process of comparison. And so the ancient teachers of the East are doing their greatest work by leading us out of a petty, self-imposed conservatism, into a universal fellowship and good will.

A. C. BOWEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CURRENT AMERICAN LITERATURE.

THE commemoration of the quarter-millenary of Harvard has served more than one useful purpose, since, besides reminding New England people that their own oldest college was founded earlier than several distinguished European Universities, it has directed general attention to the importance of preserving, or, at all events, describing other extant antiquities of the pre-revolutionary era. In Mr. Porter's book* we have not only a faithful, but, in respect of illustrations, a sumptuous record of rambles in the north end of Boston, where most of the linger ing vestiges of the colonial epoch are to be sought. In this quarto volume, of upward of 400 pages, are presented pictorial reproductions of scores of public or private buildings (all but one of which are standing), together with an adequate account of the periods in which they were erected, and of their subsequent vicissitudes. It is unquestionably true that no town or city within the present territorial limits of the United States—not even St. Augustine or Santa Fé, although these places were settled considerably earlier—can pretend to vie with Boston in the number and historical interest of its ancient edifices. Here, for instance, is Paul Revere's house, in North Square, built soon after the great fire of 1676, its predecessor on the same spot having been the parsonage of the Second Church, bought for the use of Increase Mather. We suppose that very few Bostonians could find their way to North (originally known as Clarke's) Square, which is, in fact, not a square at all, but a triangle, which, with its old cobble-stone pavement, recalls the market-place of an English provincial town. A market-place it was more than two hundred years ago, but is now, we learn, only to be reached through a narrow opening in North street, formerly known as Mountfort's Corner. In North street, opposite Sun Court, is also to be seen a little two-story, gambrel-roof house, which was erected in the reign of Charles II. In Salutation Alley, which opens out of Hanover street, and which is just wide enough to admit the passage of one wagon, is a quaint little house, the old home of Nathaniel Greenwood, which is one of the two or three oldest houses remaining in Boston. Salutation Alley, like all the other English streets of its epoch, had no side-walks, but had a gutter running through the middle. The houses bordering it had originally gardens in front, like the dwelling-houses of old London in the times preceding the great fire which took place in the reign of Charles II. The best-preserved specimen in Boston of the early style of brick houses is at No. 23 Unity street; precisely when this building was erected is not known, but it was sold to the progenitor of its present owners as early as 1724. Another brick house adjoining this, and identical with it in age and style, was, for many years, owned by Benjamin Franklin, and was the home of two of his sisters. The large brick house

*Rambles in Old Boston, New England, by Edward G. Porter. Cupples, Upham & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the corner of Salem and Bennett streets also carries us back to a period when George I. had recently come over from Hanover to ascend the English throne. Even more interesting is the fragment of an ancient wooden dwelling at the corner of Bennett and Hanover streets. This is the remnant of the house built in 1677 by Increase Mather, and in which his son, Cotton Mather, spent a part of his boyhood. The pride of the North-End of Boston is Christ Church, built in 1723, and the oldest ecclesiastical edifice now standing in Boston. Among the chief treasures of the Church is a communion service, part of which was presented by George II. in 1733, and a folio Bible, one of the so-called Vinegar Edition of 1717. The largest and most complete example of a wooden dwelling of the seventeenth century yet extant in Boston stands on the east side of Salem street. There are said to be reasons for believing that this house, which at one time belonged to Adam Winthrop, was built as early as 1680. The windows have solid plank casings, tenoned and pinned together, and the whole frame is as strong as that of an old-fashioned line-of-battle ship. We may further mention that another wooden building, still standing on a corner of Faneuil Hall Square, belongs to a period as far back as 1690, and was originally only thirty feet from the dock, which is now far distant. Faneuil Hall itself, by the way, stands on the site of what was once the town dock, to which the tide came up. But from the point of view of age the gem of old Boston is, perhaps, the Tremere house, near the extreme end of North street. This must have been erected before 1674, since a deed recording its conveyance is dated in that year. We are unable to enumerate other curious remains of ancient Boston depicted in Mr. Porter's book, but we have doubtless said enough to indicate the value of the work, from both the artistic and the antiquarian point of view, to all students of New England history, as well as to the many persons who, through birth or derivation, are bound by peculiar ties to the capital city of the Massachusetts colony.

We should have nothing but praise for Mr. Bush's account* of the first century of Harvard's corporate existence but for the sub-title which he has somewhat carelessly allowed himself to give his book. "The first American university," in any legitimate meaning of the word "American," Harvard College cannot profess to be, seeing that the universities of Lima and Mexico were each founded at least eighty years earlier. We should, however, at once say, in justice to the author, that the too pretentious designation to which we have adverted, is out of keeping with the thoroughly honest tenor of the narrative. In this book, unlike some histories of Harvard College, we are annoyed by no attempt to make great things out of small. The truth is not disguised by Mr. Bush that, for at least a century after its foundation, the institution, which laid claim to the ambitious name of college, was really in respect, both of pecuniary resources and the number of its pupils, decidedly inferior to many an endowed school of the present day, and notably, for instance, to Philip's Exeter Academy. Thus, in 1723, eighty-five years after its beginning, the college possessed a library of but 3,500 volumes, or about as many as are now contained in the library of the Golden Branch Society at Exeter. Again in 1726, the Hollis endowment of a professorship of mathematics and natural philosophy produced an income of but twenty-six pounds sterling, which was, nevertheless, considered an honorable stipend, although, after making every allowance for difference in the purchasing value of money, we can now see that it was extremely niggard. The number of pupils graduated from the college during the first sixty-five years of its existence was five hundred and thirty-one, or, on an

* Harvard, the First American University, by George Gary Bush. Cupples, Upham & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

average, only about eight a year. If, on the other hand, we look at the studies pursued, we can see that the Harvard of those days was rather a theological seminary, than an establishment intended to qualify its graduates for all the liberal professions. Unless specially excused, all students, except the Freshmen, were obliged, four days in the week, to receive instruction in Hebrew, and treatises in divinity also figure conspicuously in the lists of prescribed text-books.

We must, nevertheless, admit that, as regards proficiency in the classical languages, or at all events in Latin, young men were carried further in the Harvard of the seventeenth century than they are now in the schools that prepare lads for universities. This will be clear if we point out the requirements for admission, which, so far as Latin is concerned, do certainly seem to have been higher two and a half centuries ago than they are now. The rule laid down by President Dunster, in 1642, was that every applicant for admission must be able to "read Cicero or any other such like classical author at sight, and make and speak true Latin in verse and prose, besides declining perfectly the paradigms of nouns and verbs in the Greek tongue." Such a mastery of Latin, considered as a living language, was effected by the habitual use of it in the class room, and in familiar intercourse between teacher and pupil. How indispensable at that time the language was will be at once perceived when we recall the fact that while Mr. Dunster was presiding over the college, John Milton was employed by Cromwell to conduct diplomatic correspondence in Latin, which was then the medium of international communication, and so remained until French superseded it, owing to the material and moral ascendency of Louis XIV. Two other facts brought out by Mr. Bush throw light on the relations of students to their instructors and to one another. The practice of flogging and of boxing the ear was for several generations firmly adhered to by professors and tutors, and it is not until about 1740 that we read of corporal punishment going out of use. The origin of hazing may be recognized in the disabilities long imposed on Freshmen. The following regulations, for example, are said to have remained in force during the seventeenth century; no Freshman could wear his hat in the college yard (unless it rained, hailed, or snowed), or speak to any member of the upper classes with his hat on, and every Freshman was obliged to go on errands for his seniors, whether these were graduates or undergraduates.

Of the addresses delivered by Mr. Lowell* in England and the United States during the last six years, nine have been collected and reprinted in a single volume. Of these, the remarks on Fielding, Coleridge and Wordsworth will be reperused with interest, but the speeches of abiding value, which imperatively called for publication in a permanent form, are the address on "Democracy," read in Birmingham, England, and the Oration commemorative of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Harvard University. In the former speech, Mr. Lowell publicly discussed and answered those objections to democracy, considered as an alleged enemy to culture and refinement, which are often urged in private, though they seldom find expression in the newspapers of England or the United States. Mr. Gladstone has, indeed, essayed on several occasions to figure as the defender of the social consequences of universal suffrage, but his advocacy was less effective than is Mr. Lowell's, because he met the imputations less roundly and frankly. Yet we cannot help thinking that more cogent than any of Mr. Lowell's arguments, more illuminative and persuasive than any of his metaphors, was the influence upon his audience of his own personality. Englishmen had learned to know the speaker thoroughly, and they could not but discern in him a living demonstration that

* Democracy and other Addresses, by James Russell Lowell. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

democratic institutions are no bar to the attainment of an urbane, elevated, and many-sided culture, to the evolution of the light and sweetness which Mr. Matthew Arnold seems to think impracticable in a land where numbers rule. Of the Harvard Commemorative address, we will only say that, apart from the perfect adaptation of every word to the occasion, the most noticeable feature was the strenuous, though courteous, vindication of the title of the Greek and Latin languages to retain a large and fundamental place in a liberal education. The case for Greek has never been put more forcibly, although, as every Harvard graduate well knows, the orator was trammeled by considerations of place and time, and of deference to persons and opinions just now predominant in the Councils of the University.

One cannot run over the 500 octavo pages which Mr. Frothingham has dedicated to William Henry Channing*—full of industry, of talent, of hearty appreciation and affection as they are—without recalling the query imputed by Longfellow to Priscilla, "Why don't you speak for yourself, John?" There must be, we fancy, very few readers in this country or in England who would not rather see an autobiography of Mr. Frothingham than a biography of William Henry Channing, who, for the rising generation, will be chiefly memorable, if memorable at all, as the nephew of his uncle. For the writings of the once-famous William Ellery himself there is no longer much demand, and if the nephew, William Henry, is rescued from complete oblivion, he will owe his preservation to Mr. Frothingham. This book, however, is of an intrinsic importance, wholly independent of its biographical purpose. It is a history of liberal Christianity in the United States and England during the present century, and we suppose that no other survivor of the movement would have been so competent to write it.

Among the books called forth by the success attending the publication of Grant's memoirs, and which rely for circulation less on their intrinsic merits than on the author's personal association with the events described, the compilation by Admiral Porter† deserves particular mention. The writer speaks with a good deal of modesty respecting his own qualifications for the writing of history, and is not unwilling to acknowledge that the task may be more fittingly performed hereafter. We can see no reason for disputing the Admiral's averment that he has made up his narrative from the official record of the Navy, and that he has not allowed himself to suppress or distort facts, because he may have had official relations with particular commanders. His book, which comprises nearly 850 large quarto pages, is profusely illustrated, and the portraits alone would be likely to commend it to a wide audience.

Mr. Curtis's stout volume‡ seems to have been evolved for the purpose of demonstrating—what, so far as we know, no follower of Darwin would deny—that Darwinism is as yet unable to say precisely "at what point or stage in the series of developing animal organisms the mind of man was produced, or what it was when produced." With reference to both of these questions, the present attitude of the honest Darwinian is simply that of an agnostic, and he is willing to listen to any affirmative evidence, except that of revelation, for the hypothesis attributing a non-material origin to the mind of man. We do not understand Mr. Curtis

* Memoir of William Henry Channing, by O. B. Frothingham. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

† The Naval History of the Civil War, by Admiral David B. Porter. The Sherman Publishing Co.

‡ Creation and Evolution, by George Ticknor Curtis. Appleton & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to contend that he has submitted affirmative evidence of this kind, which, even to himself, is satisfactory. Indeed, he seems to recognize the absence of scientific proof of the non-material origin of the intellect when he designates "the great want of this age" to be "the prosecution of inquiry into the nature of the human mind as an organic structure regarded as such," by which rather equivocal language we presume the author to mean the human mind considered as an entity essentially independent of the body, and only temporarily associated with it. When Mr. Curtis goes on to say, "It seems to me that the whole mission of science is now perverted by a wrong aim, which is to find out the external to the neglect of the internal," he has either overlooked the two most distinguished names in the history of contemporary or recent philosophy—those of Hartmann and of Hartmann's master, Schopenhauer—or he strangely misconceives the point of view from which those inquirers have approached the study of the human mind. They certainly did not insist on regarding metaphysics as a department of physiology.

The Historical Atlas,* compiled by Mr. Labberton, is a credit to American cartographers, and may be heartily commended to those unable to buy the expensive work by Spruner. The 141 maps here collected begin with conjectural indications of the Old Egyptian Empire, whose seat was at Memphis, and of the (nearly contemporaneous) first period of the Chaldean ascendency in Western Asia. We are next shown, with a greater attempt at exactitude, the extension of the so-called New Egyptian Empire under Rameses II., and the circuit of Assyrian preponderance at the era of its greatest development, when, under Asshurbanipul, it stretched over Egypt, Cyprus, Palestine, and a part of Asia Minor. From that date—the seventh century B. C.—down to our own day, almost every change of reasonable duration in the political condition of every important section of the Mediterranean world is represented with a close approach to accuracy on a separate map. Especially helpful to the student will be found the map exhibiting the dominions and pretensions of Charles the Bold, and that portraying the gradual reunion of the Provinces of France to the Capetian crown. The successive transformations of England, from the landing of the Jutes to the Norman conquest, are made clear to the eye by not less than fourteen maps, supplemented by plans of the decisive battle-fields. The maps relating to Spain are the weakest features of the book. Not one of them relating to a period prior to the peace of Westphalia exhibits the two cities, Merida and Tarraco, which, throughout the Roman and Visigothic periods, were the most populous and opulent in the Peninsula. On the other hand, we note with satisfaction that Mr. Labberton is careful to bring out the existence of an independent Suevic kingdom in the northeast of the Peninsula during a considerable part of the Visigothic era. Without due attention to this fact, no one can understand the weakness of the Visigothic power at the date of the Arab invasion. We note some errors in the map illustrative of the Arabic ascendency in the first quarter of the eighth century. At that date Cyprus and Crete were not Saracenic, but still Byzantine, and the Arab conquest of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica was reserved for the Aglabite dynasty of Kairoan.

*An Historical Atlas, by Robert H. Labberton. New York: Townsend MacCoun.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED